

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from
Sweet Fund

No 59739

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. I.

List of Contributors to Volume I.

- REV. EDWIN A. ABBOTT, M.A., D.D.
MOST REV. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., ARCH-
BISHOP OF ARMAGH.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LL.D.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
RIGHT REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D., BISHOP OF DERRY
AND RAPHOE.
REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. H. W. CLARK, M.A.
STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D.
THE EDITOR.
REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. G. HARFORD, M.A.
J. H. A. HART, M.A.
REV. CANON EDWARD LEE HICKS, M.A.
REV. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.
REV. J. H. JOWETT, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE, M.A.
REV. C. LATTEY, S.J.
REV. DAVID M. McINTYRE.
REV. PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.PHIL.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. W. J. MOULTON, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. THEODORE H. ROBINSON, B.D.
REV. PROFESSOR SANDAY, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH, D.D., LL.D.
REV. W. L. WALKER, M.A.
REV. PREBENDARY B. WHITEFOORD, M.A., D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SEVENTH SERIES

Volume I

London

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

27 PATERNOSTER ROW

MCMVI

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

59739

77
11

TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF THE "EXPOSITOR."

ON the completion of twenty-one years' occupancy of the editorial chair of the *EXPOSITOR*, I may be allowed to write a few words of preface to the new series. I do not intend to survey the history of the periodical in detail, nor, tempting as the subject is, shall I essay any close record of the changes in religious thought during these years. I shall only indicate as briefly as possible the intention with which the *EXPOSITOR* has been carried on, and will be conducted in the future. Much might be said of the long and splendid list of contributors. Among them are included many of the most prominent scholars of this country, of the United States, and of the Continent. Among the dead I remember many with special affection and gratitude—among them Lightfoot, Westcott, Godet, A. B. Davidson, Milligan and Henry Drummond. Not a few of the most important books of the period have been reprinted in whole or in part from the *EXPOSITOR*, including works by Professor W. M. Ramsay, Professor George Adam Smith, and many more. The investigations first appearing in the *EXPOSITOR* are referred to in every standard commentary and dictionary, while the volumes have their place in theological libraries all over the world.

When in 1885 I became editor of the *EXPOSITOR*, it was plain to me that much space would have to be devoted to the Higher Criticism. My honoured friend and predecessor, Dr. Samuel Cox, who himself aided me with his contributions, designed the magazine mainly as a vehicle of popular, yet scholarly expositions of Holy Scripture. In this line he was himself an acknowledged master. In his time discus-

sions of such subjects as the fate of the wicked were followed with extraordinary interest. The Higher Criticism of the Old Testament was only beginning to make an impression. The slow headway made by the new criticism in this country is very difficult to understand. Colenso's books made but a slight impression even on open-minded scholars. F. D. Maurice, while chivalrously desiring to defend Colenso's position in the Church of England, absolutely loathed his opinions. Dr. Samuel Davidson, though allowed to have his say in the most powerful literary journals, hardly touched the average view. Dr. Cheyne, by his writings in the *Academy* and by his books, did as much as any one to bring the subject before serious students. But it was not till the trial of Dr. Robertson Smith by the Free Church of Scotland that the public as a whole began to see that there were problems calling for solution. I was for four years a pupil of Robertson Smith, and witnessed the progress of the long controversy, which ended in a compromise by which he retained his position as a minister, and was removed from his chair as a professor. But even when Robertson Smith published his book *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, most of those who stood up for liberty declined to accept his teachings. They could not believe in the extraordinary amount of literary fertility during the exile demanded by the critical construction of the History of Israel.

Robertson Smith was removed from his chair, but among Hebrew scholars his views made steady progress. There are still a few eminent scholars who decline to accept the newer theories, but hardly one whose opinions have not been much modified. Practically the critical view of the Old Testament is taught from every Hebrew chair in this country. In the EXPOSITOR qualified writers on both sides have been given a hearing. A new chapter in the history of Old Testament criticism has been opened by the publication

of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, with other manifestoes by Professor Cheyne, but the controversy is only beginning.

In 1885 British scholars were resting securely in a conservative view of the New Testament. This view was fortified by the great Cambridge trio, Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort. Their vast learning and authority overawed opposition, and there was very little on the other side that could be called weighty or scholarly. But now it is contended that the principles applying to the Old Testament must also be allowed to operate on the New Testament record. The Johannine problem has passed through various phases, the last, perhaps, more favourable to the old view than that which preceded it. It requires no great foresight to see that the controversy ahead of us will be concerned with the documents that make up the New Testament. The attention which has long been claimed for the Old Testament is rapidly being transferred to the New.

As to the extent to which the laity have been influenced by criticism, it is not easy to speak. Many Christians live in a settled, peaceful country, undisturbed by the border warfare. Many have found belief made much easier by the acceptance of the new positions, and popular apologetics have undergone a transformation. The style of pulpit exposition which one might almost say was inaugurated in Dr. George Adam Smith's volumes on Isaiah has brought the living message of the Old Testament home to many minds who previously found it a sealed book. On the other hand, a very large number have angrily resented the work of the critics. I suspect, indeed, that so far as the vast majority of the religious public is concerned, the methods of the critics are not understood, and their conclusions are rejected. It must be remembered that to follow the critical argument as far as ordinary readers can follow it, requires a considerable mental effort. It means, in short, some knowledge of the critical method. When to

this is added the undeniable fact that critical conclusions appear to revolutionize accepted beliefs, there need be no wonder if issues are often confused. How far certain critics themselves may be to blame, I do not venture to say. So far as the orthodox churches are concerned, it may be said with confidence that the conclusions of criticism have been accepted by their scholars only when they could not help it. Almost every scholar has begun by taking a much more conservative position than that which he occupies at this moment.

There is no reason to fear for the Bible, or for Christianity. The Bible is still the best loved of books. Competent expositions, whether given from the pulpit or from the Press, were never more valued. The living interest in the Bible steadily grows. People may be somewhat weary of criticism, but when the Bible is put to practical and devotional use by men who understand it, an eager audience is always ready. There never perhaps was a more extended appreciation of the moral power and spiritual value of Christianity. There never was a greater yearning after its succours. For Christianity no substitute, ethical or other, has been discovered. It is in sole possession as the one credible and effective religion of the world. May we not say that even the attitude of science has altered? Twenty or thirty years ago the splendid triumphs of science led to vast pretensions and to the claim of domination and sufficiency. But now the atmosphere is changed.

It is, therefore, with much hope that we commence this new and enlarged series of the EXPOSITOR. An effort will be made to make it still more helpful to preachers and to students, but the main lines on which it has been conducted will still be followed. We have been cheered by promises of help from our old contributors, and from many young and rising scholars. Among the readers of the EXPOSITOR have always been numbered many laymen, and if there is

one lesson which my experience has taught me it is the supreme importance for the Church of theological learning. No Church is wise that does not recognize the necessity of setting its best men apart for study and for teaching, and of trusting and supporting them generously. Questions are being asked, and will more and more be asked, which can only be answered by scholars. It may be hoped that this duty becomes clearer. There are reassuring signs—notably the establishment of a Theological Faculty in connexion with the Victoria University of Manchester. But there is still very much to be accomplished. Preachers are sent out too often most miserably equipped for the work they have to do. They may toil hard to acquire the missing knowledge, but in the stress of ministerial life they can never be quite successful, and they may easily become disheartened and give up the struggle. A correspondent of the *Guardian* of December 13 gives a mournful account of the present method of training in the Church of England. He says that at a representative meeting of Divinity Professors, Theological Lecturers and Examining Chaplains, it was resolved unanimously that the present system of training ordination candidates required drastic reform. He goes on to make the astounding statement that "in a diocese where candidates are recommended to read Hebrew, none of the Examining Chaplains knew Hebrew. There was one candidate who took the subject; and after some discussion on the difficulty he was eventually examined—not by the Examining Chaplains, but by the man who had been his Hebrew coach for some months past!" Nor is it enough to pass through a respectable course of theological study. The clergyman who does not keep up his studies will find that he loses influence over the best minds—that influence which remains only with those who are always humble, diligent, reverent and fearless seekers after truth.

THE EDITOR.

EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

IN speaking of evolution I use the word in a general sense as denoting the doctrine that this world with all its various forms of life has grown from small and remote beginnings under the influence of forces and laws which are still operative. It has been defined as "a continuous progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces" (Le Conte), and it is in this broadest meaning that I use the term. And in speaking of the gains which this doctrine has brought to theology, I do not intend to make any attempt to prove that it is true or that such and such modifications of theological opinion are necessary or justified, but assuming them to be proved, I wish to point out the gains to our theological thought.

There must, I think, be many theologians who are conscious that the theory of evolution has proved to be to them a real Godsend, and has flooded with light some of the darkest problems. Theology, the doctrine of God, cannot be perfected until we know more than we yet do of the actual relation of God to the world. To know that God is and that He upholds all things by His all-pervading power, is scarcely worthy of the name of knowledge, until we know something of the *method* by which God creates and brings to pass what He wills. Evolution is our greatest, almost our only teacher in this department. It gives us a reasoned, intelligible account of the method and means by which God has produced the world as it now is—it brings us within sight of God at work.

Before speaking of this, however, there are one or two general remarks which may first of all be made. In the first place, the attractiveness, I may even say, the fascination of the theory of evolution may be noted. The human mind inevitably craves not mere completeness, but unifi-

cation of its knowledge. It cannot rest until it brings into one consistent whole all the truth it knows. Until it can do so, it is not sure either of itself or of its knowledge. How satisfactory then to have a theory that applies to the whole known universe, physical, mental, spiritual. In the remotest ages, in the furthest star, the evolutionist recognizes the same laws at work as are to-day governing the life of this planet. To have a key that unlocks so many hitherto closed doors, a master-key that gives us the freedom of the universe is unquestionably a great boon.

Again, it adds a new pleasure to all investigation, the pleasure which every human being owns, of watching things grow. In every department of study all that is now with us is traced to its origin, and its growth from less to more is watched and noted with eagerness and delight. Who does not find pleasure in watching the bowl grow under the potter's hand or the processes through which filthy rags become paper, or the marvellous ingenuities of man transforming the force of falling water into light and heat for our dwellings? The marvel of the spring never ceases to affect men; the growing plant, the growing child are ever objects of intensest interest. It is there we seem to get close to the reality and power of life, and there we renew our hope for the future and learn to believe in the continuity and oneness of what is past with what is to come, of the far-off beginning and the still more remote end. The same wondering delight is experienced wherever the human mind employs itself under the guidance of this great principle.

At the heart of this delight in growth there lies a great hope. The whole world with all its various life has for millions of years been growing from good to better, and the same laws which have so far fulfilled the purpose of the Creator are still in operation and will carry it forward ever and ever to what is still higher and better.

It may further be necessary explicitly to state, what almost every one now understands, that evolutionists may be Christian—that the adoption of this theory of the method used by God in bringing things to pass does not affect our faith in Him. In point of fact evolutionists belong to every shade of belief and unbelief. At the one extreme stands the late Prof. Mivart, one of the foremost anatomists, but whose zeal for anatomy was outdone by his zeal for his church, and who combined the learning of a theologian with the insight of a biologist. He declared that evolution was perfectly consistent with the most orthodox Christian faith, and that any conclusion drawn from it to the disadvantage of religion is an illegitimate conclusion. Darwin in his great work says, “I see no good reasons why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feelings of any one” (p. 421). And the other great pioneer of evolution, Alfred Russel Wallace, says, “I believe that the universe is so constituted as to be self-regulating; that as long as it contains Life, the forms under which that life is manifested have an inherent power of adjustment to each other and to surrounding nature; and that this adjustment necessarily leads to the greatest amount of variety and beauty and enjoyment, because it does depend on general laws and not on a continual supervision and rearrangement of details. As a matter of feeling and religion I hold this to be a far higher conception of the Creator and of the Universe than that which may be called the “continual interference hypothesis” (*Natural Selection*, 268).

Mr. Butler Burke, who is supposed to have discovered the origin of life, is reported as saying, “We cannot attempt to discuss the original cause—that is beyond the scope of science altogether. But to explain things on the principle of continuity of nature seems to me to reveal the harmony of the universe in the works of the Almighty. Should my

experiments prove the possibility of "spontaneous generation," it is a principle not in the least destructive of the deistic conception of the universe."

But let us come to particulars :—

1. Evolution gives us the knowledge of God's method *in creation*. Much of course remains undiscovered. The origin of matter and the origin of life are as yet beyond the ken of science. But at any rate science has drawn aside the veil so far as to allow us to see God at work. The account of creation we have in Genesis is sublime, and one cannot read it without feeling the majesty of God. The words "God said, Let there be light, and there was light," have appeared even to the heathen mind as among the most impressive ever written. And yet so brief is the whole record of the creative work and so confined to generalities that it fails often to convey to us a definite and lasting impression of the wisdom, patience and power of the Creator. But when evolution takes us by the hand and leads us into the dark "backward and abysm of time," when it shows us, as if we were ourselves present, the stars and worlds taking shape, when one is summoned to travel through millions of ages each with its work to accomplish, when we find each hour and day of it all forwarding the one result, when we recognize that through all this immeasurable time no change of dynasty has occurred, but we are everywhere face to face with one purpose, one supreme and unchanged will, one mighty hand, we see at last the very reality of God's greatness and measure His wisdom by the work it has done. It has been my experience, and I suppose the experience of thousands besides, to be quite overwhelmed by a sense of God's greatness when thus brought into the presence of the actual processes of creation. No general terms of description, however highly pitched and appropriate, can convey the impression made by the thing itself,

and it is when we trace God carrying His purpose of creating man through millions of ages and working towards it through what to us appear a thousand risks and hazards that we seem to see God's majesty and can truly adore His creating power.

It may be thought that this insight into the creative process with its accompanying vivid and convincing exhibition of God as Creator is more than counterbalanced by the knowledge it brings that instead of being directly created by God six thousand years ago, man has been slowly evolved from the lower creation and has actually existed on earth some thirty thousand years. But if this be the truth, it is a gain to know it ; and our natural repugnance to finding in our pedigree animals of lower grade is alleviated by the general consideration that origins even of the most beautiful things in life are often unsavoury, and that if the alternative is that our origin was clay, there is little to choose between, so far as our own taste is concerned. As the ancient cynic said, " Why should a man be proud (like the Athenians) of being sprung from the soil with the worms and snails ? " The loveliest flower may have its root in filth ; and much of our present knowledge can be traced back to what is grotesque and even hideous ; but in judging of any living thing you must take into account its end and destiny as well as its origin. There is a great truth in the old maxim " *omnis origo pudenda* " : trace anything you please back to its remotest physical origin and you find yourself face to face with that which you would fain veil or forget. But this is only nature's testimony that she is ever passing from baseness to glory, and that out of rudest materials God can fulfil His bright and unsurpassable designs.

2. But on the evolutionary construction of the creation and origin of man what are we to make of the Fall, of Sin,

and of Death—these three great factors in the theology of Paul ?

a. The Fall. Accepting the evolutionary account of man's origin, we can no longer think of the Fall as a lapse from a condition of perfect righteousness, but rather as marking the point at which *the characteristic of man as a moral being* was reached. Slowly moving upward from the level of the lower animals the creature at last became man. But the point at which he could at length be quite distinguished from inferior races was not determined by his attaining the upright walk, or a greater power of communicating with his fellows, or even a power to use tools and weapons—though Tubal-Cain is posterior to Adam—but the power to discern between right and wrong. At this day there are living on this earth races which, though possessed of the *physical* characteristics of humanity, have not attained to the knowledge of good and evil. They are comparable to children, living out their natural instincts, innocently doing wrong, naked and unashamed, and so far as civilization goes as guiltless of it as the rhinoceros or the crocodile. These tribes, like young children, are ignorant of a moral law. They have the capacity of developing into fully equipped human beings, but as yet little more than the capacity.

In the description given us in *Genesis* of man before the Fall, we find much that is reproduced among savages. Man does not as yet till the ground, but lives on fruit or nature's spontaneous products. He does not recognize the desirableness of clothing of some kind. He has no house or fixed abode ; no tools, no books, none of the ordinary equipment of civilized life. Above all he has not yet tasted of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil. He is innocent : but innocent because he has not yet recognized that there is a law ; that there is good and evil. There are two

sayings of St. Paul which throw much light on this condition : the one is "First that which is natural : afterwards that which is spiritual"—the other is, "where there is no law, sin is not imputed." First that which is natural : creation furnishes a nature capable of moral perfection, but moral perfection is not of nature but of will. Where there is no will, there is no morality. Trial is essential to morality. Man does not become a moral being, does not become man, until in presence of evil he can choose the good. He cannot know good until he knows evil. The child strays into a garden and eats dangerous fruits and destroys costly plants, but does nothing worthy of punishment because no commandment has been given him. He is neither evil nor good, but innocent. It is when the law comes, when this and that is marked as evil that man's trial commences and that he becomes a moral being.

The Fall marks this point—the point at which he recognizes that there are certain things he must not do—that he is not like his fellow-creatures to whom nothing is right or wrong, but that he is capable of something higher than following his instincts, can conquer and command these instincts and obey a higher will and set before him an ideal perfect if as yet unattainable. In a word the Fall marks a point at which the merely animal condition is left behind and *man* is born.

As to the *designation* by which this great step has been known, little stress need be laid upon that. It *was* in one aspect a "Fall," while in another aspect it was a step in advance. It is conceivable that man should have triumphed in his first temptation. It is conceivable that his first experience of the distinction between good and evil should have been signalized by his choice of the good in presence of and in preference to the evil. That is conceivable, but certainly it was not probable—one might almost venture to say that,

all things considered, it was impossible. And it is significant of the keen moral insight of the author of the narrative of Genesis, that he so clearly intimates that man's first knowledge of the distinction between good and evil was marked by his choosing the evil, in other words by disobedience to what he knew to be his duty, and therefore by sin which he recognized as sin and so worthy of punishment. And this is placed at the very beginning of the history of the race—before this, there is no history—this is marked by the very first step in human history—the step by which man became man, with all his tremendous responsibilities and tragic unfitness to bear them.

The first sin then was a Fall, inasmuch as it was man's first acquaintance with moral evil and culpability and severance from God: it was an advance because it marked man's growth from the innocence of the animal, the child, or the savage, to the responsibility, the knowledge of good and evil, which characterises man.

It is frequently stated that if you remove the idea of the Fall as given in Genesis the whole Pauline system of redemption falls to the ground. This, however, is a hasty and unwarranted statement. What Paul's gospel requires as its basis is the conception of sin as offence against God and its universality. A theory as to the origin of sin he no doubt held, but it was not on this theory that he built his gospel but on the fact everywhere visible that men are sinners.

β. Sin. But does not this idea of human origin and development very seriously modify or even alter the character of sin? Evolution assures us that we are slowly finding our way upwards from an animal origin; like Milton's lion pawing to get free from the mud which encumbers and detains his hinder parts. All men sin, if by that

you mean that all men give way to appetite or are roused to violence or adopt crafty methods of attaining their ends, because the whole race has but a short time since been detached from its animal progenitors and as yet is only working its way towards the ideal manhood. Sin, or what we call sin, is a mere survival, reminding us of our origin. The animal passions that survive in us are as little blameworthy as are the rudimentary hind-legs of the boa-constrictor. They tell us what we once were. They somewhat hinder our present life ; but they will ultimately disappear by the operation of the laws of evolution. We are destined to

Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die.

But even though we accept the evolutionist account of man's descent from creatures without responsibility, this cannot prove that our sense of responsibility is a delusion. To explain the origins of things is the task which men of this generation have been confronted with, but supposing this task to be finished, we have still to ask, What is the present value and character of things ? This is not determined by their origin. Our intellect may be the developed product of the unthinking instincts and sensations of unreasoning animals, but this explanation of origin does not discredit or diminish the powers of a Shakespeare or a Newton. And similarly, from whatever germs in primitive man or by whatever methods the sense of responsibility has been produced, here it is now, telling us our duty, keeping before us an ideal, an ethical standard, and making intelligible the words "guilt" and "punishment." Supposing we are being slowly evolved from the brute creation, we must accept the new responsibilities of this growth ; as the head of an important department or service who has developed out of an irresponsible office-boy accepts his responsibilities. At each stage of evolution the functions,

organs, habits, and ends of the animal change. The quadruped, though developed out of the fish, can no longer live as the fish lived ; nor the bird as the reptile. Neither can the man any longer live as if he were on the lower level of his origin. The power of conceiving the good carries with it an obligation to achieve it.

γ. Has the doctrine of evolution any light to throw on those constant problems of human life, the presence of pain, the inevitableness of death, and the obscurity of the state that follows ?

(a) On the mystery of pain, some ray of light is shed. For evolution convinces us that we live in an imperfect world, imperfect both physically and morally. In such a world pain and suffering would seem to be inevitable. We are a part of nature and share its fortunes, exposed physically to the accidents, diseases, and death which necessarily form a large ingredient in the physical world. We are in a growing world. The best attainable world lies ahead. This world may become the best, but on the evolutionary hypothesis, it is not yet the best. It may, for all we know, be the best possible. It may have been necessary to begin at the beginning. Certainly it is impossible to conceive a world better fitted for the training of human beings. Whether we could have been in any other kind of world is a question beyond our scope, involving the discussion of the creation or eternity of matter, and the examination of various forms of monism. The human mind is not naturally capable of determining what is possible and what impossible for God. He is limited in the moral region—that is to say, in dealing with moral beings He must deal with them as moral beings, not as clay or gas or metal. He is so far conditioned, and for all we know He may be similarly conditioned in dealing with the physical worlds. And though we know so little of such conditions it somewhat reconciles

us to things as they are, to know that they are moving on to something better, and that this progress cannot stop till perfection is attained. And this is the lesson of evolution.

After all, as Dr. Ward suggested, we are but mice shut up in a harpsichord, seeing the hammers strike and hearing the music, but unable to see the player or to understand the whole symphony. Or, as Seneca puts it, "What that is, without which nothing, is, we have no capacity of knowing—the greatest part of the universe, God Himself, is hid from us. How much of nature has first become known in our own time, and how many things unknown to us will the men of to-morrow discover; and for those future ages when our memory shall have wholly passed away, how much remains to be known" (*Nat. Quaest.*, vii. p. 371).

(b) While some in passing through this life may have little pain, or at least only what seems light when put in the balance against the joy they have had, there is no one who can prolong his days or add a cubit to his measured portion. Death is universal. So far as we know, there is nothing possessed of organic life on this planet which does not die. The inconceivable abundance and variety of life is only the obverse of the inconceivable range and ceaseless impact of death. By day and by night, on land and sea, in the air above and in the depths below, death reigns. Countless myriads enter life every hour, and countless myriads leave it; often probably with little or no pain, but not rarely in a paralysis of terror or in torture that elicits screams of agony. Constant warfare is the law of life among animals. The multitudinous life of the lower creation is supported to a large extent by as multitudinous a death.

Now regarding this universal, natural, and yet in many aspects obscure fact of death, evolution has at any rate two suggestions to make. If, as this hypothesis assures us, this world is in a condition of flux, not yet having attained its

end, but always making progress towards it, then death is, so far as we can see, an absolute necessity—not merely the physical necessity arising from the circumstance that being dust we must return to dust, or, in other words, being derived from and upheld by the material of this world we must share in the necessary decay of this material; but also that unless generation after generation were removed from earth the progress designed could not be achieved. For were men not compulsorily removed, new and fresh generations would become impossible, and all human thoughts, customs, institutions, would harden to a worse than Chinese stagnation. The generation in possession would allow of no alien immigrants to consume the barely sufficient fruits of labour and lower the conditions of pleasant living. The increase of human population would cease—the white-headed multi-centenarians would hold the world; and no new blood being admitted, no aspiring dreams of youth, no men with their way to make and their life to live, looking at the world with fresh eyes and from other points of view, all progress would cease and the physical end might as well come at once.

But further, evolution has found for us the most satisfying argument for immortality, apart from revelation. Natural arguments for immortality, as they are called, really avail very little. Cicero's experience in connexion with the argument of the *Phaedo* is repeated in the case of every one who follows any of the usual pleadings: "As I read Plato," he says, "I assent, but when I lay the book aside and begin reflecting by myself upon the immortality of souls, all that assent slips gradually away." So it is always: there seems considerable force in what is urged in favour of personal existence after death, and yet the mind falls back to the appalling fact that with those who have passed out of the present bodily life we can have no communication, and can-

not form any mental conception of their mode of life or their employments. Through the foolish mire in the Hippolytus Euripides has once for all uttered the universal sentiment of the hopeless natural man : “ Whatever far-off state there may be that is dearer to man than life, Darkness has it in her arms and hides it in cloud. Therefore, infatuated, we are in love with this that glitters here on the earth, because no man has tasted another life, because the things beneath are unrevealed and we float upon a stream of legend ” (Hipp. 192). Almost as pathetic is the manful resolve of Simmias in the Phaedo (85.D), who declares that a man in search of the knowledge of a future life should persevere until he has achieved one of two things : either he should discover or be taught the truth about it ; or, *if this be impossible*, I would have him take the best and most irrefragable of human theories and let this be the raft upon which he sails through life—not without risk, as I admit, if he cannot find some word of God which will more surely and safely carry him.” But the most eminent expositor of evolution, the late John Fiske, puts into our hands an argument for immortality of the most persuasive kind—an argument too long to quote in full, but which proceeds upon the fact fundamental to the theory of evolution, that all development of organ has been accomplished in response to “ actual existences outside.” From this it is argued that man’s religious life has also been developed in response to the appeal of a really existent spiritual world.

3. The doctrine of evolution illuminates not only the past but the future. It has taught us the all-important truth that *progress* is of the very essence of this world’s constitution. Growth, advance, approximation to the ideal, lies at the very heart of things. God is always going forward, never going back ; always bringing in something better ; superseding the crude by the mature ; introducing the perfect

and the eternal by means of what is always growing old and passing away. Rigid conservatives are out of harmony with the living God and His method. If the world is a world in process of growth, how foolish and fatal is the delusion that possesses those who obstinately cling to what is crumbling in their hands, who do not recognize that when the old has served its generation it must give place to that which it has itself begotten, to the new ideas and activities and methods which are its own necessary result.

But the thought arises, If things are so ordered that progress is the necessary law, may not the world of men be left, as the other creatures are left, to be improved by the operation of the laws which preside over the evolutionary process? Is there any need of so catastrophic a redemption as we have in Christ; so pronounced a break in nature's evolution as we believe occurs in the Incarnation? This opens the gate into a field very inviting but too wide to explore, and it can only be said that Christ is a fact; His interference and the measurelessly beneficent consequences are facts; He is *there*, and His contribution to the world's progress must now be taken into account. That He is not the mere evolutionary product of what went before, is the faith of the Christian. He stands ever separate from sinners; a new insertion in this world's life, not explicable by or referrible to natural forces. He brings in a new life, a new world, a new outlook. Like those great breaks in continuity, the beginning of life, the brain of man, which evolutionists have as yet not accounted for, Christ stands unaccountable save by the direct interference of God. Coming thus He starts a fresh era in the evolution of man. Science assures us that in man the culmination of physical evolution is reached and that henceforth it must run on mental and moral lines. In Christ we have the dynamic for this further and finer evolution. In Him reside and from Him proceed

those very forces which at length will accomplish the utmost for man and fulfil the grand purpose of the Creator.

It may indeed be objected that such results of Christ's entrance into human history are not discernible—that nothing is more obvious or distressing than the fact that that which was meant for our redemption should be to so large an extent a failure or even an aggravation of the disease—that Christianity should so slowly gain access to all men and that even where it has long been known the results should be so disappointing—that in many parts of the world where it once prevailed, it can now be traced only by a few surviving superstitions, a casual inscription, a faint echo in a dead land. But here also evolution steps in with its lantern and bids us see *real* contents in the words that a thousand years are with God as one day, it turns our gaze upon the past millions of ages and shows us with what deliberation and apparent slowness, with how many refluxes of the wave of progress the high-water mark was at last gained, and how without haste as without rest God marched towards His end. If man's physical constitution was so slow in elaboration, if a hundred millions of years were consumed in preparing a dwelling place for him and in evolving his wonderful body out of the lower creation that slowly yielded its treasure and as if reluctantly disclosed its wealth, can we marvel that the final result, the manifestation of the sons of God, is not to be achieved in a few centuries or with fewer hazards, disappointments, and delays ?

All tended to mankind,
And, man produced, all has its end *thus far* ;
But in completed man begins anew
A tendency to God. Prognostics told
Man's near approach ; so in man's self arise
August anticipations, symbols, types,
Of a dim splendour ever on before
In that eternal circle run by life.—*Paracelsus*.

MARCUS DODS,

*THE COMMUNISTIC EXPERIMENT OF ACTS II.
AND IV.*

I SHALL assume that in these two passages we have a genuine record of facts. St. Luke—whom I take to be the author of the Acts—was not indeed an eyewitness of this portion of the story. It belongs to a period and to a locality somewhat distantly removed from his ken. But he had sources which were authentic: the early chapters of the Acts are from an authority which is peculiarly Jewish, and bears the marks of personal and intimate knowledge. St. Luke, too, was a persistent inquirer, and a careful writer. I assume the statements to be true as they stand.

Further, in the course of these early chapters the author (whether the writer of the Hebrew original, or St. Luke his editor) has a way of pausing from time to time in the narrative, to review the position, and to sum up the growth and prospects of the nascent church. Every reader of Acts will have noticed this feature. Now the two passages before us are summaries of this kind. It is also clear that the second is an expansion of the former, telling us that this charitable zeal of the church increased yet more between chapters ii. and iv., and found its full tide at the stage described in the latter. So much for the statements which we have to discuss.

Before discussing them, I have a word or two to say respecting the whole question of riches and poverty, and of communism, as raised by the New Testament narrative. For in dealing with this problem we must begin before the Acts. We start from the life and teaching of our Master Himself. Our Lord quite literally “for our sakes became poor.” He was born into a quiet household of the middle class. His family—on the human side—had a splendid lineage, reckoning King David as its founder; and in point

of worldly means, was removed from grinding poverty. St. Joseph, and doubtless the Blessed Virgin also, worked with their hands. The life of the Nazarene home was extremely simple ; but it was as far from squalor as from opulence. It was an example of plain living and high thinking. But from the moment when the call came at the Baptism for the public mission to begin, our Saviour forsook all that He had. His initial fast in the wilderness was the keynote of His whole life afterwards. He ceased to possess anything, and was a mendicant. He lived on the charity of others. I will not stay to ask why. We may find one reason in the awful gulf which in that time and region (as many things in the gospel story assure us) divided rich and poor. We may find another reason in the fact that the struggle between the haves and the have-nots seems co-extensive with humanity, and lies at the root of all—or nearly all—the tragedies of history. How important our Saviour deemed the matter, we perceive, when He required of each member of the Twelve the same complete renunciation of all things. He and His Twelve lived a common life : they are a brotherhood (St. John xx. 17) : they have a common purse : it is supplied by the gifts of holy women and others (“ who ministered unto Him of their substance ”). At times they ran short of food, as in the cornfield on that Sabbath morning, and when they were crossing the lake, or when they were glad to pick up the broken victuals and save them for their Master and themselves. Quite literally Christ “ had not where to lay His head ” ; i.e. apart from the charity of others such as Lazarus, or the nameless owner of the Upper Room at Jerusalem. We who read the Gospels seldom bring home to our imaginations as we should the utter self-denial of the life of Christ. But the Twelve had been steeped in the spirit of that life. In their experimental mission-journey, they had already practised

its principles (St. Mark vi. 8): He "commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse; but be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats." They are to be mendicants, like Himself, and each pair is to constitute (so to say) the germ of a brotherhood.

I stay not to dwell on the romantic story of St. Francis, and of the literal following of Christ which that beautiful soul practised in his own amazing life, and required of his first disciples. It wrought a revolution in Christianity, and revived the life of the church. I only refer to that wonderful episode of the thirteenth century to show that in all our thoughts about riches and poverty, and the self-denial of the wealthy for love of the poor, we must begin by contemplating our Lord. We may not feel convinced that the rule of St. Francis is the wisest to adopt to-day. But his method is sound: we should learn, like him, of Christ.

Our Lord, then, had taught His disciples to give up all they had, and to live a common life. The principle of His small brotherhood was mendicant and communistic.

Was it any wonder then, if so soon as the Holy Spirit had begun to work in the first Christians at Jerusalem, and they felt themselves faced by the problem of poverty at Jerusalem, their minds instinctively turned to their great Exemplar? We may be sure that none of the apostles at Jerusalem possessed anything of his own: they lived still—as they had when the Lord was with them—on the charity of the church. Unable themselves to relieve the poor—for they had nothing whatever to give—"silver and gold have I none"—they asked, and with powerful persuasion, the help of others' alms. The majority of the Christian converts in Jerusalem were probably poor. It is so in most towns and communities now. I shall presently have to point to some peculiar reasons why poverty was a chronic difficulty

at Jerusalem. Also many of the Christians had offended their families by joining the church, and (like St. Paul) had suffered the loss of all things to win Christ. Accordingly we read that the apostles had very early to establish a system of almsgiving. There was a daily provision of food for widows and others. Presently the Seven are ordained to meet the difficulties of distribution. Very early in the church "widows" became a kind of Order, charged with duties of sick visiting and other services of mercy, while receiving a pension from the church funds. The duties of the *πρεσβύτεροι* or *ἐπίσκοποι* at Ephesus, or Philippi, and all through the series of churches founded by St. Paul or St. Barnabas or St. Peter, would be far more duties of finance than of worship. They had first and foremost to take care of and expend the common fund of the church, and be the agents of its abundant charity. We know that the burial of the dead very early became one of the regular charges on the common fund of a local church; so that to the eye of the Cæsar and the Roman officials the church figured as a sort of burial society. Nor was such a system in the least foreign to the pagan world. Throughout the Roman empire, and still more in pre-Roman as in Roman Greece, brotherhoods and associations for charitable or public purposes—always dignified by religious worship—were perfectly common. Trades guilds, benefit societies, and burial clubs are no modern or mediæval creation; nor do they date from the Christian era.

I want you to perceive how natural it was, how obvious and inevitable, that the apostles should meet this problem of poverty in the church of Jerusalem by what strikes us as an extraordinary scheme of self-denial. "They had all things common," we read in Acts ii. 44; and this is immediately explained by the statement that "they kept selling their lands and possessions, and distributed them among

all, according as each had need." The process is made still clearer in chapter iv. 32, where we read :—

“And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any (of them) that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common . . . and great grace was upon them all. Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things which were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made to every man, according as he had need.”

I understand by this, first, that the poor in the church, so far as they needed it, were fed and clothed from a common fund, and this as a matter of brotherly kindness, not as a condescension or “charity.” That such brotherly bounty involved certain moral dangers, we infer from our own experience, and perceive from the warnings of St. Paul in 1 Timothy v., where he orders widows under sixty to be struck off the list of charity, and similarly all “widows” having children or grandchildren who ought to keep them; similarly at the end of 1 Timothy (ch. v.) he orders idlers and “busy-bodies” to be excluded from the charity of the church, recalling what he had taught “that if any could not work neither should he eat.” We may find a significant reference to the same difficulty in the last verses of the Epistle to Titus, “And let ours also learn to maintain honest trades for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful.” The boundless charity of the primitive church, and its institution of a common charitable fund, was liable to be abused, and to become a moral danger.

But the words of Acts ii. and iv. may seem to imply something more than the institution of a common fund, however large. Is it meant that the owners of property realized everything, and divested themselves of all, and themselves

became pensioners of the common fund ? *I think decidedly not* ; and for several valid reasons.

(1) The object was the relief of the poor. It would not have helped the poor to add to their number.

(2) The help given was not the same to all. Some needed more, some less. Some needed one form of charity, others another kind. The phrase is emphatic " according as everyone had need." Some could earn a little, some more ; illness or age made others penniless. But every case was met, and discreetly dealt with, by the brotherly love of the church.

(3) It was not made a condition of church membership that every one should pool his possessions. The act was voluntary. Some sacrificed more, some less. That the sacrifice was optional is expressly stated. " Whiles it remained, was it not thine own ? and when it was sold, was it not still in thine own power ? " (Acts v. 4). Indeed the whole point of the story of Ananias and Sapphira hinges on their sacrifice being voluntary. Such voluntary acts of sacrifice at once brought the authors into high repute and favour. There grew up a moral obligation, something like a moral compulsion upon the rich to do the like. It could not be otherwise. And this brought about the temptation of Ananias and Sapphira. For reasons which may have been honourable, they were not prepared to impoverish themselves beyond a particular point. They sold their land—an olive-yard near Jerusalem, perhaps, or a piece of cornland farther down the hills, or a house and site in Jerusalem. Everybody knew what it was and where it was, but they wished to retain part of the price so realized. At the same time they were unwilling to lose the credit of having done a splendid act of self-denial. Their sin was therefore first and foremost hypocrisy, and the motive of the hypocrisy was vanity, and, conflicting with their vanity,

the love of money. Their hypocrisy was too closely identical with the hypocrisy of the Pharisees which had stirred the wrath of our Saviour, for His apostles to endure it. It is the besetting sin of all religion. It was exposed and avenged by an awful punishment.

I think therefore that we must not press too closely the words "they had all things common." It means certainly that every poor Christian could find help from a common fund; and that this common fund was maintained by the heroic self-sacrifice of the rich. But I do not think it means that every Christian at Jerusalem was divested of property and lived on the common fund. It means only that the rich became poor, and all realized their brotherhood and equality in the church.

(4) This view is confirmed by the way in which St. Luke introduces the story of Ananias and Sapphira. They were stimulated to their deed of generosity by the example of Joseph Bar-nabas, a Cypriote Jew, of the tribe of Levi, who, having land, sold it and added the money to the common fund. All that we read of Barnabas afterwards reveals him as a man of singular gifts of the spirit—tolerance, sweetness of temper, unselfishness, sympathy, charity.

In his subsequent missionary journey Barnabas shared from the first, and continued after his separation, the principle and practice of his great companion Paul, viz. : never to expect, or receive (if he could help it) any gift or support from the churches he founded or visited. This was an unusual stretch of independence and unselfishness : it was peculiar to Barnabas and Paul. St. Peter never practised it, nor other apostles. St. Paul explicitly tells us it was unusual, and the foregoing of a right—the rule which Christ Himself had laid down, viz., that the apostles should be supported by their converts. We have, then, in Joseph Barnabas a man of exceptional and heroic self-denial in

matters of money. I think it possible that in his case the sale of the land meant the denuding of himself of all that he had. His after life was the life of an apostle, and on his journeys he, like St. Paul, was supported by the bounty of the church which sent him out (viz. Antioch), or by his own handiwork ; for every Jew had a trade between his fingers. The heroic generosity of Joseph Barnabas was hailed with loud praise by the church. It meant a mighty victory for the gospel : it was a glorious triumph of grace. Ananias and Sapphira desired to emulate this heroic deed ; to win like admiration without the self-sacrifice. Does not the whole story imply that the act of Joseph Barnabas was exceptional in its degree ?

I have no thesis to maintain. I only want to discover the truth. Of course the experiment in Acts has been frequently adduced by advocates of socialism as committing Christianity to some form of communism.

To my mind it leaves the question where it found it. If collective ownership of all things, if a socialistic commonwealth, such as many have dreamt of, be the goal of economic progress, the right aim of social reform, it is so because of its inherent expediency and wisdom, not because of this experiment. Christianity is not committed to any form of government, or any form of social organization. It "is like liquid, and fits any vessel," as St. Francis de Sales quaintly said. Christianity may find its fullest scope, its richest moral developments, in a democratic commonwealth and in a highly socialized form of community. That, I think, is certain. But Christianity is not committed to a revolutionary agitation for this or that form of polity or this or that type of social organization.

What seems to me far more clear—and indeed as clear as day—is that our Lord teaches by word and by example the awful dangers of wealth. It is so hard for a rich man

to be a good man ; so unlikely for a rich society to be a healthy society ; so unlikely for a wealthy class to be on the right side in national controversies. It is so difficult for a man, as he prospers in the acquisition of wealth and comfort, to remain a keen observer of social evils, and an active, courageous, and intelligent reformer. It is in this doctrine, upon which our Lord laid such tremendous emphasis, that we shall find the starting point of all proposals for the more social and collective use of the goods of this world. It seems to me that my Christian socialist friends do but weaken the force of their arguments by laying over-much stress upon this communistic experiment of the Acts.

For observe, the experiment, if it was really communistic (which I do not believe), soon came to an end. It left the poverty of Judæan Christianity what it was before. Ten years later the Gentile church of Antioch sends Barnabas and Paul to the Jewish church of Jerusalem with relief "to the brethren." Ten or fifteen years later still St. Paul encourages the Gentile churches all round the Mediterranean to do the same on a still larger scale—showing that poverty was a chronic malady of the Christian Jews of Jerusalem, as of the Judæan community in general.

Why was this helpless poverty so constant a feature of life in Jerusalem ? I think the answer is not far to seek. And yet I have searched in vain for any treatment of the question in any ordinary works of reference. What I say, therefore, on this topic is my own and needs criticism.

Now Jerusalem was a much larger city, and had a far larger population than could be accounted for by the industries which existed there. These lay all about it, of course, lands wherein grew the olive, the fig and the vine, besides the cornlands and sheep fields of the lower country. But the land near Jerusalem was not so rich as to

be capable of supporting a large population. The greatness of Jerusalem of course depended on its Temple, and the vast system of sacrificial worship of which the Temple was the centre. A numerous hierarchy of priests and ministers found in that system their occupation and their living. These ministers had their families and dependents, all of whom lived upon the perquisites of the Temple worship. A whole world of peculiar trades lived indirectly upon the Temple system—cattle dealers, drovers, shepherds, dealers in hides and offal, tanners (e.g., Simon of Joppa); growers of all sorts of agricultural produce, and dealers therein; also workers in textiles, fullers, embroiderers; builders, too, and repairers of buildings: these, and numbers of others, were needed by the incessant round of Temple services. For pilgrims were constantly visiting the Temple, and every Jew throughout the world paid his poll tax yearly of half a shekel for the maintenance of the central sanctuary (St. Matt. xvii. 24). At certain times of year the tide of pilgrimage overflowed all bounds. The city was packed with tens of thousands of worshippers from every land. They had to be housed and fed. And though an oriental crowd of pilgrims made smaller demands upon space and comfort than the like multitude in the west, and though it may sound absurd to make comparison between those far-off days and our own, yet it may be suggested that much of the money that was earned by the rank and file of the resident population of Jerusalem must have come from the profitable visits of pilgrims. At the feasts the city was deluged with them; food was at a premium, every kind of accommodation was in demand; no resident was without employment and without reward. Then, between the festivals, all was slack, and poverty resumed her sway. It is, I believe, observed that in all cities where the chief industry is the attendance upon seasonal visitors—and like the university towns of

Oxford and Cambridge on the fashionable watering-places—there is a painful amount of helpless poverty. There is not only the evil of seasonal employment, but also the unwholesome contrast between the rich and the poor—the rich being represented by the spending holiday makers and the poor by the hungry resident. I incline to think that (*mutatis mutandis*) Jerusalem in the first century presented a similar social problem. Its poverty was chronic; it had a class of dependent poor, created and fostered by the very conditions of the life of the place.

I have one further word to add. To the ear of a pious Jew of our Lord's time, whether Christian Jew or unbelieving—the word "poor" conveyed a far more beautiful group of ideas than to our own. The epithet "poor" had become associated with sanctity and piety, in contrast with worldliness and irreligion. We remember how in the Psalms (e.g. Ps. x. and many others) "the poor" seem identified with the righteous and the faithful. They are objects of contempt and malevolence on the part of the great and powerful; but they are beloved of God. Whence this canonization of poverty? It is a characteristic of the post-exilic Psalms. It goes back to the time when the remnant of faithful Jews returned from captivity, poor in this world, but rich in faith. Their more worldly and prosperous brethren were content to stay in Chaldæa. But "the poor," after long struggle with hindrances of every kind, brought about the restoration of the church and of the nation. Then came the influence of the Syrian kings whose policy it was to Hellenize the Jewish people. The wealthier classes, the more worldly families, doubtless found that their interest coincided with the polity of their rulers. A process of disintegration set in, and the religion of the Jews was menaced by a powerful solvent. But the faithful, the patriotic, felt the danger, and were willing to sacrifice all

worldly advantage for the defence of their religion. When Antiochus Epiphanes decided to use coercion and to precipitate the process of Hellenization, the patriots, the poor saints, led by the Maccabaeian house, rose in revolt, and their successful opposition to the Syrian kings is one of the most romantic episodes in all history. But a new glory attached to the party of faith, of unworldly attachment to the Law, to those who were willing to be poor, rather than prosper as recreants: the title "the poor" came almost to be equivalent to pious and faithful. When our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount said, "Blessed are the poor," the word teemed with associations half political, half religious, in the ear of the Jews. The central idea of the word was not mere absence of wealth, but the prevalence of an unworldly spirit. Hence St. Matthew in recording the saying adds his gloss: "Blessed are the poor [in spirit]," to avoid misinterpretation.

And when the Christian Church at Jerusalem found in its ranks many impoverished members—some of whom certainly had suffered the loss of all worldly prospects because they had embraced the new faith—we can understand with what a halo of religious heroism their poverty was clothed in the imagination of men who had been cradled in Hebrew traditions, and who had shared the voluntary poverty of their Divine Lord Himself.

EDWARD LEE HICKS.

THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS OF LYCAONIA.

IN the EXPOSITOR for December I gave various examples of Christian inscriptions from Lycaonia¹ bearing on the

¹ We take this geographical term in the sense of the Byzantine Province from 371 onwards. I have added a few illustrative epitaphs from Laodiceia and Tyriaion, which were in Byzantine Pisidia, but geographically stand in much closer relation to Iconium than to Antioch. Laodiceia certainly, and Tyriaion probably, had been in Provincia Galatia along

organization of the local churches and congregations. It was there argued that these inscriptions as a rule belong to the fourth century. A few may be as early as the third century, and a very few as late as the fifth; but as a whole it is the fourth century that is set before us in these simple documents, and it is to Basil and the Gregories that we must turn for illustrations of them. The majority of the inscriptions show us a rather simpler and more primitive state of things than the letters of Basil.

Another example of an early bishop may be quoted from a metrical epitaph found at Tyriaion:—

This is the tomb of Matriona, daughter of the Bishop Mnesitheos (whom all honoured, for thus it was reasonable). And her husband and dearest children, Aur. Varellianus¹ to his own wife, and the children Ammia and Hermianos to their own mother, erected (the tomb) in remembrance.

The name Varellianus, which often occurs in this class of inscriptions, is a metathesis of Valerianus. It cannot be supposed that it took its origin from the persecuting emperor, Valerian. It is a name whose connexion with *valere*, “to be strong,” suited the Christian taste, like Valentilla, one of the commonest female names in Christian Lycaonian inscriptions,² Valentina, etc. The double formula, old and new, may be taken as indicating a date about 350–380 A.D. (see p. 451).

An unnoticed example of Oikonomos used simply as a title, implying probably presbyter or bishop as administrator of a village church, occurs in the district of Drya, the extreme northern bishopric of Lycaonia (united with Gdamava).

with Iconium, etc., in the Roman period (down to c. 295), and their conversion proceeded from Iconium, probably.

¹ Correct the published text to *Αύ.* or *Αύ* [*ρ.*] *Ὀυαρελλιανός*. The epigraphic text has not been published, but only the transcription (Anderson in *Journ. of Hell. Studies*, 1889, p. 126, No. 88). The name (which is usually spelt Varellianos) occurs also Laodiceia (No. 18) and often.

² No. 137 in *Journ. of Hell. Stud.*, 1899, p. 124 (Drya), and No. 212, *ibid.*, p. 296, must therefore be reckoned Christian.

Gallikos the oikonomos of the people Plommeis.¹

It would be quite contrary to analogy, and perhaps to the permissible possibilities of usage,² to take Gallicus here as a slave of the emperor stationed in this village (after a fashion illustrated for Laodiceia and Zizima in *Classical Review*, Oct. 1905, p. 369).

In confirmation of the proof given above on p. 455 that a deaconess was sometimes wife of a person who held no office in the Church, we may quote Laodiceia, No. 65 :—

Here lies Appas, the Reader (the younger tall son of Faustinus), to whom his mother Aurelia Faustina the Deaconess erected this heroön³ in remembrance.

An interesting little epitaph is the following from Tyriaion :—

Here lies (*sic!*) Heraklius and Patricius and Polykarpus Presbyters : in remembrance.

It is remarkable to find three presbyters in a common grave. The reason may probably be that they perished together in a persecution (like the five Phrygian “ children, who at one occasion gained the lot of life ” : *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 730) ; if so, their death might confidently be placed during the last persecution, somewhere near A.D. 300 ; but, as that would carry the initial formula back further than we have hitherto put it, we must regard the point as uncertain. There is, of course, no reason why the Latin formula should not have been imitated in Lycaonia as early as A.D. 300.⁴

¹ Anderson, in *Journ. of Hell. Studies*, 1899, p. 124, No. 136. The symbols, basket on table and cooking-pot on a portable charcoal fire-place, which are shown under the inscription, are common on tomb-stones of the district, pagan and Christian alike. I have copied many examples. They point to a time not later than the fourth century.

² *Exactor reipublicae Nacolensium*, C.I.L. iii. 349, is hardly a sufficient defence.

³ Read ἀνήγειρε[ν] for ἀνηγίρη[θ]η.

⁴ *Journ. of Hell. Studies*, 1893, p. 127, No. 91.

In 324-5 Gregory, father of the more famous Gregory Nazianzus, was converted from the sect of the Hypsistarii to the Orthodox Church. The sect took its name from its worship of the Most High God alone (*θεὸς ὑψίστος*); it is said to have adored light and fire, but to have used neither sacrifice nor images of God, to have kept the Sabbath and certain rules of clean and unclean foods, but not to have practised circumcision. Gregory of Nyssa about 380 speaks of a sect Hypsistianoi,¹ who adored the one God, styling him Hypsistos or Pantokrator, but not Father. Neither sect (if they are two sects, and not one) can be traced in that precise form outside of Cappadocia. About them we have only the untrustworthy account contained in the brief allusions of two of their opponents, whose hatred for the Hypsistianoi makes it impossible to regard what they say as a fair account.

It is possible that the inscriptions of Iconium may throw some light on this obscure sect. There is every probability that a Cappadocian sect should spread also into Lycaonia, for there is no natural line of demarcation in the dead level plain where the frontier of the two Provinces lay. The epitaph quoted on p. 455 may commemorate a priest or Bishop of the sect. At any rate it probably originated in circumstances similar to those which produced the Cappadocian sect. Gourdos is in that epitaph called "priest of the most high God";² but the style and character of the document seems to permit no doubt that it is Christian and did not emanate from a half-pagan, half-Jewish eclectic sect, such as the two Gregories describe. It is probable that their denial of the Christian character of the sect was merely the result of prejudice and ill-feeling, and that the Iconian epitaph is a fairer and safer witness to the character of the

¹ *Contra Eunom.*, ed. Migne, vol. ii. p. 482 ff.

² *ἱερεὺς θεοῦ ὑψίστου* (where the metre would require *ὑψίστοις*).

Hypsistarii than the malignant account of ecclesiastical enemies. If our opinion be not correct, the only alternative that is open would probably be to maintain that the epitaph originated in ordinary Christian circles, where the Cappadocian sect was unknown and where the typical epithet (which in Cappadocia would have proved the sect) was used as a right and orthodox term, occurring often in the Bible.

A second epitaph partakes of the same character—

The God of the tribes of Israel. Here lie the bones of the prudent deacon Paul; and we adjure the Almighty God [to punish any violator of the tomb ?].¹

The abbreviations ΘC and ΘN for God marks this as the product of a more developed thought than most of the epitaphs of Lycaonia. Here the other typical epithet Pantokrator is used. The occurrence of the two epithets marking the Cappadocian sect in two Iconian epitaphs favours the opinion that both inscriptions originate from a branch of the Hypsistarii in Iconium. It is however possible that this second epitaph originated in a Jewish circle, though the most probable view perhaps is that a branch of the Jewish Christians survived in Lycaonia, and were nicknamed Hypsistarii by the "orthodox" Christians of the fourth century from their fondness for that favourite Jewish phrase, "the most High": they had been so far influenced by surrounding opinion as to abandon circumcision.

The sect of the Novatians is known in this region from an inscription of Laodiceia, referred to above, p. 444. The names were there given falsely, owing to a confusion between two inscriptions of the same place and period. It must therefore be given accurately:—

Aurelia Domna erected to my sweetest husband Tinoutos,

¹ C.I.G. 9270. The copy of Lucas has Φωτων instead of Φυλλων. The correction made in the Corpus is probably right.

most pious Deacon of the holy Church of God of the Novatians, in remembrance.¹

An inscription found at Apa, about six miles west of Isaura Nova, bears witness to Christian influence, though it originates from pagan circles :—

Ma, daughter of Pappas, virgin and by race priestess of the Goddess and the Saints, at her own expense restored, and tiled the roof of, the temple.²

This document might be attributed to some eclectic sect ; but it seems more probable that it belongs to the pagan revival in the opening years of the fourth century, which coincided with the greatest and last persecutions. Ma restored a dismantled and ruined temple of the Goddess in her village. Some remarkable examples of the pagan reaction, philosophic and religious, have been found in Phrygia ; some belong to the same period as this, and one is dated in the year of the great persecution of Decius.³ The concurrence of pagan revivalism with persecution is described and explained in the present writer's *Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 108–110.

Closely related to one of the most difficult problems in the development of ecclesiastical organization is a brief epitaph on a small round pillar at Alkaran, three miles north of Isaura Nova :—

IN MEMORY
OF CONON,
SUPERINTENDENT (προϊσταμένου).

The epitaph of Conon must be read in connexion with Basil's *Epist.* 190, addressed about 374 or 375 to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. Shortly before this letter was written, the Province of Lycaonia had been formed out of

¹ The words "sweetest" and "erected" are both repeated, betraying an ignorant and uneducated composer, C.I.G. 9268.

² Published by MM. Radet & Paris in *Bull. Corresp. Hell.* 1887, p. 63, who transcribe M. 'A. Παππᾶ instead of Mā Παππᾶ.

³ See *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. pp. 495 note 3, and 566 f.

parts taken from the three older Provinces—Galatia, Pisidia, and Isaura. Previously it had ranked second in the Province of Pisidia (Antioch being first), henceforward it ranked first in the Province of Lycaonia: yet Basil continues in his letters to speak of it as a city of Pisidia, even after the new Province was constituted.¹ The new Province came into existence in or about 371. Its Bishop, Faustinus, died in 372 or 373. He was followed by John, who soon was succeeded by Amphilochius, probably early in 374.

Not long after Amphilochius was consecrated Bishop of Iconium, the bishopric of Isaura Palaia became vacant. That city had been the capital and metropolis of the old Province Isauria (as appears in the lists of the Nicene Council, A.D. 325). It had, apparently, succeeded in establishing a certain authority over various smaller towns around, so that these should not have Bishops of their own, but should obey the Bishop of Isaura. Amphilochius desired to maintain or restore the original ecclesiastical system, according to which each separate town had had its own Bishop; and he wrote to Basil stating that opinion. Basil replied in *Epist.* 190, in a somewhat doubtful way. He first expressed the most polite agreement with his correspondent's view that "the care of the district should be divided among several Bishops." But he proceeded to point out the difficulty of finding so many suitable men to entrust with this responsible duty; and expressed his fear that the appointment of unworthy men might produce indifference and carelessness among the congregations,² as the latter take

¹ *Epist.* 138: "Iconium is a city of Pisidia, formerly the first after the greatest city (viz. Antioch), and now it is itself the capital of a division which, having been formed out of different sections [i.e. parts cut off from the three older Provinces], received the constitution of a distinct Province."

² τοῖς λαοῖς: the contrast of laity and clergy is expressed here, see above, p. 450.

their tone from their governors.¹ He therefore urged that the best course would be to select, if possible, "as governor and Bishop² of the city [Isaura] some one well-approved man, and entrust to his sole responsibility the administration of details—provided only that he be a slave of God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed (2 Tim. ii. 15), not looking on his own things (Phil. ii. 4), but on the things of the multitude, that they be saved (1 Thess. ii. 16); who, if he sees that the charge is too great for him, will associate with himself other labourers for the harvest"—i.e., as we may suppose, he will appoint Bishops or chorepiscopoi in the outlying towns and villages of the district. Basil adds very emphatically that such a one would be worth many, and that this method of organizing the Church would be most safe and advantageous.

The brief sketch of the ideal Bishop here given is interesting: it shows what Basil's aim was in his own administration of his vast diocese.

But if such a man cannot be found, Basil advises that the appointment of a new Bishop of Isaura should be postponed, and that superintendents should first be appointed in the towns and villages; this would prevent the Bishop, when he was appointed, from attempting to extend his authority over these smaller places.

To judge from the language of Basil here, it would appear that the superintendents were to have the authority of Bishops, each in his own town; and from the inscription we gather that the title *Proïstamenos* was applied to them. Basil says explicitly that these superintendents were to be appointed in those towns and villages which had formerly had Bishops' chairs, implying that the right had fallen into disuse. He apparently hesitated to appoint Bishops, in the

¹ οἱ προεστῶτες.

² προστάτην τῆς πόλεως.

fullest sense, in those towns, and therefore advised only the nomination of superintendents, with a humbler title, but with real authority.

It is noteworthy that Basil here designates the new Bishop of Isaura by the term *Prostates*, apparently implying that something of temporal and civic authority belonged to this Bishop (a point to which we shall return).

We observe that in this letter Basil connects the "administration" of the Church with the Bishop¹—the same point of view which we found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, book ii., as contrasted with the Lycaonian inscriptions, which rather associate that duty with Presbyters. This confirms the chronological arrangement, which has been already set forth. The inscriptions which have hitherto been discussed convey the impression of belonging as a whole to an earlier and less organized period than that which is presented in Basil's letters. Our chronology, at any rate, does not err by assigning too early a date to the inscriptions. If anything, our dates are slightly too late, but this is the safer side to err upon; and I do not think the documents discussed can safely be placed much earlier than the dates we have assigned.

We notice also here the terms "Slave of God" and "Church of God," which we have regarded as coming into Lycaonian epigraphy between 350 and 400 A.D. To comprehend the former rightly, we must remember that to the ancients a slave appeared to be a far more trustworthy and faithful servant than a hired labourer (*mercennarius*), as the latter looked only to his fee and how he might most easily obtain it, while the slave worked as a duty and from affection—a very different view from that which is possible with modern systems of slavery in civilized states.

¹ Ποιεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομεῖσθαι : and οἰκονομησαὶ τῶν ψυχῶν τὴν οἰκονομίαν : and πρὸς τὴν οἰκονομίαν (of the churches).

The epitaph of Conon takes us into this Isauran district, and shows us, probably, what was the issue. The letters of Basil do not tell which alternative was followed by Amphilochius; but from the epitaph it is clear that he appointed superintendents.¹ Conon was one of those Proïstamenoï, and about that time (375 A.D.), or a little later, he administered one of the villages (undoubtedly a prosperous and large village in a very fertile district, on the edge of the Isaurian land). We may with considerable confidence date the epitaph of Conon about A.D. 400. He may very well have been one of the men appointed by Amphilochius in 375. If he was a successor, he is not likely to have been much later than 400, as the system does not appear to have lasted long. The supreme authority of Isaura was probably restored; and it seems to have ceased after a time even to be subject to the authority of Iconium, and to have been reckoned as an independent, autokephalos bishopric, directly responsible to Constantinople alone.²

As to the distinction between Isaura Palaia and Isaura Nova, and the doubt which of the two sent a bishop to represent it at Chalcedon in 451, it would not be possible to enter on those questions at present.³

The epitaph of Conon is clearly marked by epigraphic features as one of the latest in the district about Isaura Nova. The form of the letters is Byzantine in character (though not so markedly so as those in the inscription mentioned on p. 442, lines 12-15), and the title "superintendent" is abbreviated, so that it must have been

¹ Basil's letter conveys the impression that the first plan was, in his opinion, an ideal too difficult to realize, and that he preferred the second as a practical plan.

² See my paper on Lycaonia in *Oesterreich. Jahreshefte*, 1904 (*Beiblatt*), pp. 77-79.

³ See preceding footnote.

recognized as a regular ecclesiastical title. The maker of the tomb is not mentioned. From every point of view the epitaph is of the later type; and yet we have found that it is not likely to be later than about A.D. 400.

The following epitaph, engraved on the tomb of a physician at Alkaran, near Isaura Nova, probably belongs to the period 350-400 A.D. The first two lines are in rude metre: the last two are in prose:—

Here the earth contains Priscus, who was an excellent physician during the sixty years of his age. And (his tomb) was erected by his son Timotheos and his own consort Alexandria, in honour.¹

This inscription is engraved above an elaborate ornamentation, partly incised, partly in relief, varied from the usual Isauran architectural scheme. There are the usual four columns supporting three pediments or arches, which, in this case, are all rounded.² In each of the three spaces between the four columns is a fish. The central arch is filled with the common shell pattern; the other two contain a doubtful symbol, perhaps a large fir-cone.

The ornament is executed in rude village work, quite different from the fine lines of the Dorla (Isauran) work, and distinctly later in style and in conception than it. Epigraphical reasons point to the same conclusion. The formula "Here the earth contains" is a mere poetic variation of "Here lies," the later formula which took the place of the older formula stating that "so-and-so made the tomb," or "honoured" or "set up" the deceased. These circumstances point to a later date. On the other hand, the second part of the physician's epitaph follows the old

¹ TIMI. at the end: perhaps the beginning of *τιμῆς χάριν*, but the available space is exhausted, and the rest of the stone is crowded with ornamentation, so that the concluding letters were never engraved.

² In the ordinary Isauran scheme, the two side pediments are pointed: see the example in EXPOSITOR, March, 1905, p. 214.

formula : " his son and wife set up." The mixture of the old and the new formulæ has been assigned already to the third quarter of the fourth century, about A.D. 350-380.

The praise given in this epitaph to the physician at the end of his long career is quite in the style of Basil, who says, in writing to the physician Eustathius about 374 A.D. : " Humanity is the regular business of all you who practise as physicians. And, in my opinion, to put your science at the head and front of life's pursuits is to decide reasonably and rightly. This, at all events, seems to be the case if man's most precious possession, life, is painful and not worth living unless it be lived in health, and if for health we are dependent on your skill " (*Epist.* 189).¹

We notice also the emphasis which the ornamentation on the tombstone of Priscus lays on his Christian character. The connexion of the physician with religion and his interest in it are emphasized in Basil's two letters to Eustathius (151 and 189). He writes : " In your own case medicine is seen, as it were, with two right hands : you enlarge the accepted limits of philanthropy by not confining the application of your skill to men's bodies, but by attending also to the cure of the diseases of their souls " (*Epist.* 189).² The letter to the physician Pasinicus (324) also shows on what friendly terms Basil wrote to men of this profession, and how much he seems to have esteemed their educated view of life ; while he corresponded with Eustathius as a valued and respected friend on whose sympathy he could rely.³

A metrical epitaph found beside Derbe may belong to the

¹ Translation of Mr. Blomfield Jackson.

² See preceding note.

³ While respecting educated physicians, Basil was not above the belief in cures by words and charms, provided they were Christian, as the present writer has pointed out in more detail in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. clxxxvi. p. 427.

tomb erected by one of those Christian physicians over his child :—

Thou hast caused sorrow to thy companions (i.e. by thy death) and in exceeding degree to thy parents ; and thy name is Herakleon, son of Hermeros, physician.¹

The initial metrical formula appears in a somewhat more elaborate form in another epitaph, found near Isaura Nova in a bridge at Dinek Serai :—

Here the bounteous earth, taking him to her bosom, contains
Papax, who lived a just one among men and whom Vanalis,
his daughter, honoured with monument and beauteous muse,
longing for the dead one.

The imitation marks the two epitaphs as of the same period, which is proved also by the presence in both of the new formula followed by the old. As one epitaph is Christian, the other may confidently be set down as also Christian.

The criterion by which in Phrygia many early Christian inscriptions reveal their religion—the concluding curse against the violator of the tomb in some such form as “he shall have to reckon with God”—is almost entirely wanting in Lycaonia, where such imprecations are rarely appended to epitaphs. One example is published by Mr. Cronin from the copy of a Greek physician, ending with the words, “Whosoever shall force an entrance, shall give account to God” ; but it is not certain that this epitaph belongs to Konia or to Lycaonia.²

One or two other examples occur in northern Lycaonia ;

¹ Radet-Paris in *Bull. Corresp. Hell.* 1886, p. 510 ; Sterrett, in his *Wolfe Expedition*, No. 29, p. 28.

² The physician, who allowed me in 1901 to copy about 100 inscriptions from his note books, had travelled along many of the roads radiating from Konia, generally within a distance of 50 or 60 miles from the city. He was careless in noting the place of origin, and his copies were sometimes very far from correct, where the stone was worn and the letters difficult. I have recopied most of those which he showed me, in various localities ; but this one and nearly a dozen others depend on his copy alone. I saw him also in 1890, and transcribed part of his collection. This epitaph is in *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* 1901, p. 354, No. 98.

and there can therefore be no doubt that in the region which was most immediately under the influence of Iconian Christianity, several varieties of this kind of Christianized imprecation were in use at one time. The reason why it was far commoner in Phrygia than in Lycaonia must be that it was an early formula, which passed into disuse in the fourth century. The Lycaonian inscriptions, therefore, which belong as a rule to the fourth century, rarely use it; some of the Lycaonian epitaphs in which it occurs belong beyond all doubt to that century, proving that it lingered on in a sporadic way.

Another example of the curse against violators of the tomb is the following from Laodiceia, No. 45 :¹—

¹ The priest (hiercus) of the Trinity, Hesychius, wise, true, faithful worker . . . and if any one shall lay another in the tomb, he shall render judicial account to the living Judge.

The opening formula is of the later class, the allusion to a priest of the Trinity is of the developed ecclesiastical type, and the simple cross at the beginning is not early; and yet the concluding expression cannot be placed with any probability later than about 400 A.D., as this originally pagan, and in the strict sense non-Christian, habit of curse seems to be inconsistent with developed Christian custom, which no longer set such value on the inviolability of the grave (see above, p. 458 f.).

Another example, probably of the same period, occurs at Laodiceia (No. 18) :—

—, son of Valerianus, quaestor, erected the inscription, while still living, to my sweetest wife Flavia Sosanna and my foster-child² Sophronia in remembrance : if any one shall put another in (the tomb), he shall give account to God.

¹ *Ath. Mittheil.* 1888, p. 249: correct the published text to *πιστὸς [ἐρ]γάρης*. The beginning is in iambic metre. Five or six short lines are almost wholly lost in the middle; these must have contained some expression indicating burial or rest in the tomb, but they also contained some proper names, including *M[η]νὸφιλος*.

² Foundling or adopted, *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 545 f.

The name Valerianus seems to have been common among the Christians of Lycaonia, chiefly with transposed consonants, Varelianus (as mentioned at the beginning of this article).

A small series of inscriptions relates to that interesting but enigmatical institution in the early Church, the Parthenoi or Virgins. One of these was found at Drya.¹

Aur(elia) Matrōna, (daughter) of Strabo, to her own daughter, a Virgin, Douda, erected in remembrance.

The name Matrōna occurs not infrequently in Christian Lycaonian inscriptions. It is not in keeping with ancient custom that the epithet Parthenos should be added in a pagan inscription in prose simply to show that Douda died unmarried; I know nothing to justify such an opinion. Probably the word must be taken in the Christian ecclesiastical sense.

A second example has been quoted above on page 457.

A third is one of a pair found at Laodiceia:—

Gaius Julius Patricius erected to my sweetest aunt Orestina, who lived in virginity, in remembrance.

Gaius Julius Patricius erected this inscription to my dearest brother Mnesitheos in remembrance.

This pair of inscriptions on one stone is certainly early. The letters are fine and good, the formula is of the earlier class, and the full Roman name seems to have disappeared from popular use in this region during the fourth century. The widening of the area of Roman citizenship by Caracalla about 212, by giving every free man a right to the Roman citizenship and the full Roman name, destroyed its distinctiveness and honourable character.

It would not be justifiable to regard the word *ἐγκρατευσάμενη* here as necessarily a proof that Orestina stood

¹ The most northern town of Lycaonia. The epitaph is published in *Journ. of Hell. Studies*, 1899, p. 121.

² *ἐγκρατευσάμενη*: Laodiceia, No. 138 (*Ath. Mittheil.* 1888, p. 272).

apart from the Orthodox and Catholic Church, or was connected with any definite Enkratite sect or system. The use of the word *ἐνκράτεια* twice in the long metrical epitaph of the Presbyter Nestor, quoted below, shows clearly that no extravagant asceticism is implied by these terms, for in one case the quality is ascribed to the Presbyter's wife. But the following hitherto unpublished epitaph found near Laodiceia shows that there was in that city a congregation of sectarian character, probably with Enkratite tendencies, and it may well be that Orestina belonged to that congregation.

Doudousa, daughter of Menneas, son of Gaianos, who became He(gou)menos of the sainted and pure Church of God, to Aur. Fata my much beloved daughter and only child erected this tombstone, and of myself in my lifetime in remembrance.¹

Here beyond all question Doudousa is described (regardless of gender) as the Hegoumenos of the holy pure Church of God. She seems to have been one of those female leaders of unorthodox religious movements, so many of whom are known in Asia Minor, from the lady of Thyatira (Rev. ii. 20) downwards. It is hardly possible to regard a female leader as belonging to the Orthodox Church; and the epithet "pure" applied to the Church in which she was a leader seems perhaps to lay more emphasis on the ascetic tendency than the orthodox opinion approved.

The following inscription of Laodiceia (found at Serai-Inn in 1904) is probably of the late fourth century:—

Here has been laid to rest she who was kind to mortals and beautiful in form, by name Zoe, whom all held in great honour; and to her a tomb was built by her husband and

¹ The text of this quaint epitaph deserves to be quoted:

Δούδουσα, θυγάτηρ Μεννέου Γα[ιανού ?, γειν]αμένη ἰ(γού)μενος τῆς ἀγέλας [κέ] καθαρῶς τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ ἐκκλησεῖας Αὐρ. Τάτα τῇ πολυποθειωτάτῃ κέ μονογενῆ μου θυγατρὶ ἀνέστησα τὴν ἰσθήλην ταύτην κέ ἑαυτῆς ζῶσα μνήμη χάριν. The title *ιμενος*, though not marked as an abbreviation (whereas *Θῦ* is), can hardly be for anything except *ἡγούμενος*: the masculine form is remarkable.

also by her sister, Varelianos with Theosebia, very pious Virgin, a memory of the generation of men, for that is the privilege of the dead.

The abbreviation of an already stereotyped epithet, $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta(\epsilon\acute{\iota})$ or $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta(\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta)$, proves that "Virgin" must here be taken in its technical sense as an ecclesiastical term. The prose epithet, "friend of all," which is characteristic of Christian epitaphs,¹ is here transformed for metrical reasons into the much poorer term "kind to mortals."²

The date of this inscription is proved, also, both by the late formula, and by the shape of the stone, which I have observed only in the later Christian tombs: it is not a simple stele of the earlier class with pointed or rounded or square top, but one with a rude resemblance to a Herm, with circular head springing from broad shoulders. On the head-piece is incised an ornament like a six-leaved rosette, which was probably understood by the Christians as an elaboration of the old monogrammatic symbol X , i.e. $\text{I}(\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma)\text{X}(\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma)$ ³: yet the occurrence of the older formula in l. 3 makes it unsafe to date the tomb later than 370 or 380, on the principles which we have been following. Although the technical term $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta.$ in abbreviation is a mark of lateness, yet it cannot be doubted that Basil would have written in that way; and we may safely admit that the usage may have been practised as early as A.D. 375, in epigraphy as well as in handwriting.

On the other hand, it was impossible to regard Virgin as indicating a Christian office in the inscription quoted above,

¹ See EXPOSITOR, 1905, March, p. 216, *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii.

² ἐνθάδε κεκήδευτε φιλόβροτος ἀγλαόμορφος
 ὄνομα (δέ) Ζόη τὴν περτίσσκον ἅπαντες
 τῆ δ' ἄρα τύμβον ἔδιμαν ἐὸς πόσις ἡδ' ἄμ' ἀδελφῆ,
 Οὐαρελιανὸς σὺν Θεοσεβίῃ εὐλαβ. παρθένῳ,
 μνήμην ἀνδρῶν γενεῆς, τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων

In l. 2 δέ was omitted by fault of composer or engraver; but the metre requires it. In l. 1 δ was inserted, but the metre rejects it.

³ See EXPOSITOR, March 1905, p. 220 f.

p. 37, though its use there shows that the term was recognized and imitated as a Christian feature. In an epitaph found between Isaura Nova and Derbe, and published by my friend Professor Sterrett in his *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 32 :

T. Claudius Vetera,¹ father, and Atilia Ingenua, mother,
did honour to Atilia Martina their daughter of fifteen years :
[Crown in relief],
virgin of Apollonia : in honour.

The last words are obscure and uncertain. The first word is *παρθέναν*, which is perhaps a mere misspelling of *παρθένον*, and the whole phrase, in its separation from the rest, must have a special meaning. The crown indicates that some peculiar honour was paid to her, and the last words are a sort of title accompanying the honour : “maid of Apollonia.”² The spirit of the inscription is that of ordinary joyous pagan society, not of the more austere Christian life. It is also possible that Parthena should be taken as a proper name, in which case Apollonia would be the mother’s name ; but how this could be reconciled with the rest of the inscription I fail to see.

The character of the epitaph of Zoe is illustrated by the following, found in the same village in 1904 : it is engraved on a stele of the same late shape like a Herm, and apparently the letters **Α** and **Ω** separated by a cross were placed on the head-piece ; but only **Α** can now be distinguished.

✠ Minneas, the very pious Deacon, son of Leontikos, is here hid in earth, who was adorned with all virtue in life, and having put in action Godlike wisdom, he lies here. And his

¹ Sterrett takes *Ούετρα* as abbreviated [from *veteranus*. More probably it is the Roman name *Vetus*, of which the accusative is, in the usual popular fashion, regarded as the typical form ; so the Romans called *Τάρας* (*Τάραντα*) Tarentum, *Μαλόσεις* Maleventum, *Ἀκράγας* Agrigentum, etc.

² *Apo[llon]ia* is conjectural. Sterrett reads **ΑΠΟΔΑ ΙΑC**, marking in his transcription six letters as lost. In 1890 I compared his copy with the stone, and noted that only two letters are lost between **A** and **I**. All the letters here are much worn, and I conjecture that **ΔΑ** is falsely read for **ΛΛ**. No restoration seems possible from **ΔΑ**.

sweet brother lies along with him, good Trophimos, who completed his life honourably. And their sister Maria, in longing affection, raised this inscription in remembrance.¹
 [Cross in circle.] [Six-leaved rosette in circle.]

The two ornaments below the inscription are evidently intended to balance one another, and both of them must have had a Christian meaning. The body of the stele is divided by a sort of cross (having the upper arm longer than the lower, and two very short side-arms) into four panels, like the ordinary class of pagan tombstones shaped like doors; and the inscription is written over the panels.

A rare class of expression is found in the following examples. The first belongs to the Isaurian land, south from Isaura Nova, and is published by Professor Sterrett (*Wolfe Exped.* p. 60).

[So-and-so,] while still living, inscribed the stele for himself, faithful slave-boy of [Jesus] Christ.²

The second was copied by my friend and old pupil, Professor T. Callander, at Savatra in Lycaonia, and is still unpublished :—

The attendant of Christ, Paulus, I lie in this tomb, and to me the gravestone was set up by my young sister Maria in solemn remembrance for her only brother.³

The third belongs to the same place and authority : it is a mere concluding fragment :—

- ¹ Μιννέαν τὸν εὐλαβ(ῆ) διακονοῦν υἱὸν Λεοντικῶ ἐνθάδε γέα καλύπτει,
 δς πάσης ἀρέτης κεκοσμημένος (sic !) ἦν ἐνὶ βίῳ
 κὲ θεεικῆν σοφίαν ἐκτελέσας ἐνθάδε κίτε
 τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ γλυκερὸς ἀδελφ[ὸς] συνκατάκιτε
 Τρόφιμος ἀγαθὸς καλῶς βιῶν ἐξετέλει(σ)εν
 τῶν δ' ἀδελφῆ ποθέουσ(α) ἀνέστησεν τόδε τίτλον
 Μαρία μνήμης χάριν.

The metre is exceptionally bad in this case.

² Read [ἐγγρα]ψεν instead of [ἔστει]ψεν

³ ΧΥ θεράπων Πα[ῦ]λος ἐν τῷδε τύμβῳ κατάκι[μ]ε
 σῆμα δέ μοι τεύξεν ἡθέος κασιγνή[τη]

Μαρία μνήμης εἵνεκα σεμνῆς οἴῳ κασιγνήτῳ

θεράπων, like ὑπάων above, is equivalent to *comes*, subordinate companion.

the brothers, attendants of Christ, constructed.¹

In these simple and unpretending documents, the composition of private persons often of the less educated strata of society, we see how many glimpses are opened up into the Church and the religion of the fourth century—the many contending sects of Christians, the struggle of the pagan revival against the new faith, the growth of ecclesiastical feeling and terminology, the care for the poor, the curing of the sick, hospitality to strangers, and so on.

I append, as an afterthought suggested by an inscription still unpublished, that the rosette on Christian tombstones may have been understood symbolically as a star.

W. M. RAMSAY.

DR. EMIL REICH ON THE FAILURE OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.²

THIS book challenges comparison with Torrey's *Divine Origin of the Bible*.

The two apologies for Holy Scripture emanate from persons very differently situated : the one a revivalist preacher, the other a lecturer on history and politics to fashionable audiences in London. Nevertheless their books agree in some curious ways. Both endeavour to deal with a vast subject in a very modest compass : Dr. Reich in some 35,000 words, Dr. Torrey in about half the number. Neither *displays*—I do not say *possesses*—more than a superficial acquaintance with the subject ; and both agree, alas, in vilifying those who are opposed to them. The sceptics with whom Dr. Torrey argues are, he tells us, to be found in taverns, gambling-hells, and even worse places ; Dr. Reich's

¹ κασιγνήτοι Χριστοῦ θεράποντες ἔτευσαν.

² *The Failure of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible*, by Emil Reich (Nisbet, 1904).

opponents are not indeed so located by him, but nevertheless they are compared to inquisitors, and said to employ the poison of vile insinuation. And both positively declare that the systems against which they have taken up arms are exploded, and yet both seem more uneasy about them than this belief would warrant.

It is unlikely that Dr. Torrey's book was ever subjected to the unfavourable criticism from which Reich's has suffered, and this is because some of its methods excluded it from attacks of the same sort. The Bible, Dr. Torrey holds, ought to be studied on the knees ; if critics find unanswerable difficulties therein, it is because they have forgotten how to pray. Wagers—or something of the sort—were made by Dr. Torrey with “unbelievers” that if they read and prayed for a certain period, all their scepticism would disappear ; and, when the terms of the wager were kept, it would appear that Dr. Torrey won. Difficulties that are soluble by devotional exercise are clearly not the difficulties that are soluble by ordinary processes of reasoning ; the author therefore is dealing with experiences which even reviewers who have not shared them are likely to respect. Many of them would rejoice to learn that devotion could succeed where commonplace methods of reasoning fail. So far then as Dr. Torrey appeals to the emotions, he is safe from their attacks. It is rather where he offers solutions which might occur to a man sitting in his chair, that he fails to satisfy. Such cases are his suggestion that the Crucifixion may have taken place on the Wednesday, to account for the “three days and three nights” ; or that the second verse of Genesis should be rendered “and the earth became waste and desolate” in order to harmonize the Biblical account of creation with modern geology. The almost certain rejection which will be accorded to these suggestions will be due to their belonging to the same plane

as the objections : having nothing "transcendental" about them.

Dr. Reich does not adopt quite the same devotional attitude, though he agrees with Dr. Torrey in the employment of arguments which by general consent are excluded from scientific debate. The attestation of the Founder of Christianity to the truth of the Old Testament is employed by both : Dr. Torrey gives it a rather more prominent place than his colleague, and tries to extend the attestation to the New Testament also. Both appeal to the enormous practical value of the Bible ; and this argument also has to be excluded from the lecture-room. Still, though for any scientific purpose the value of Dr. Torrey's book is exceedingly small, for the missionary preacher, who has to deal with the sceptic of "the tavern or gambling-room," he has provided a useful compendium. Of the value of religion for purposes of education and reform there is very little doubt ; and Dr. Torrey's great and successful experience renders his opinion authoritative on the mode by which such persons should be approached, and the Bible be brought to bear on their sad or desperate case. If there be any analogy between bodily and moral disease, the food to be administered to the diseased disposition would probably differ very considerably from that which would suit the healthy soul.

Dr. Reich's work does not lay claim to the indulgence which is rightly meted out to works which have a definite moral and religious aim, and the tone which he has adopted is such as to provoke contradiction in impartial readers and alarm and distrust among friends. An Indian gentleman was once asked to lecture on temperance before an English audience, ready to acquiesce and applaud. When he began by observing that in India murder was thought a venial offence as compared with drunkenness, those who had invited him to lecture began to repent of having done so ; for

such exaggerated advocacy could only injure their cause. So there may be many readers of *The Failure of the Higher Criticism* who would gladly be convinced of the historical character of Moses ; but they will be unpleasantly thrilled by the sentence, “ it is no exaggeration to say that he who denies the historic existence of Moses, denies the Mediterranean, the Nile, and the Euphrates.” For they will be aware that this is not indeed an exaggeration—yet only in the sense that an exaggeration is a proposition quantitatively false, but otherwise true ; whereas this statement appears to have no grain of truth anywhere. It is difficult indeed to credit any one with so crass a form of determinism as that which would profess to deduce Moses (and, we suppose, the ten plagues) from the existence of the two rivers and a sea ; the pretensions of the old astrology were modest in comparison. An assertion of this sort will therefore inspire the opposite of confidence in the most favourably disposed.

Perhaps we should infer from this sentence, as from many others, that it is the author’s intention to persuade rather than to convince : for indeed vehement asseveration can perhaps compass the former, but not the latter of these results. None of us are disposed to deny (the existence of) the Nile, etc., because we have either ourselves seen and sailed them, or known trustworthy persons who professed to have done so, and respectable steamship companies which offer to take us to them. And clearly none of these masses of water are artificial, and designed by Moses, as the Suez Canal was by de Lesseps : so that to deny de Lesseps might be made equivalent to denying the Suez Canal. Nor on the other hand can it be said that the existence of Moses is inextricably bound up with that of the nations who lived by those waters ; for with the Mediterranean and Euphrates he had, even according to the Bible, no connexion, and as

early as the first century A.D. (and indeed earlier) persons who had access to lost Egyptian annals searched vainly for some one to identify with the Hebrew leader. Hence we can only treat this sentence as an expression of the author's earnest conviction of the historical truth of the Biblical narrative ; and since in these days it is still uncertain what attitude the churches will eventually adopt towards the new treatment of their sacred books, such vehement attestation on the part of an historical student is by no means an unwelcome contribution to a difficult subject.

For the rest it is undesirable to reiterate the unfavourable criticisms which have already been passed on the book, and which it certainly took no pains to avoid. It will be more interesting to call attention to such of its contents as deserve appreciation or gratitude.

In the opening chapter we are made acquainted with some legends current among the Masai, a negro tribe in German East Africa, whose religion has been studied by Captain Merker, and described in a work as yet little known in England. These negroes were found by him, according to his statement, to be in possession of a series of narratives closely resembling those at the beginning of Genesis, and even some in Exodus. These include the stories of Paradise and the Fall, the first murder, the Ark with the dove and the rainbow, and the delivery of a decalogue on a mountain amid thunder and storm. The names employed bear no resemblance to the Biblical names, but otherwise the similarity is remarkable.

Dr. Reich infers from this fact, not that the Biblical narratives are historically accurate, but that those are in error who trace them to Babylonian sources ; he supposes that the stories must have been current in Arabia in pre-historic times, whence they are found in the possession of nations whose ancestors migrated from Arabia at very

different periods. To most readers it will seem far more likely that the Masai legends (if their existence should be confirmed) will turn out to have originated from the teaching of Christian missionaries removed by no long distance from our own day : of other cases in which savages have been credited with a tradition of the Deluge this has been seen to be the solution. Should the connexion between the narratives be more remote, the prospect of an interesting study in comparative folklore is held out.

A fact to which attention is rightly called is that many men of practical ability have had little or no sympathy with modern Biblical criticism. The public will be disposed to think (against Dr. Reich) that those who have devoted their whole time to the study must be more competent to give an opinion than persons whose main business has lain elsewhere ; but of the fact, whatever its psychological explanation, it is easy to find illustrations. Both the most prominent English statesmen of the nineteenth century—Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield—entered the field of controversy as orthodox theologians. From passages in the *Life of Lord George Bentinck* it might even be argued that the latter would have approved of Dr. Reich's identification of anti-Semitism with the Higher Criticism ; an identification hard to be maintained in the face of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. The private letters of Prince Bismarck give evidence of sympathy with orthodox evangelicalism ; and those of the late Lord Selborne contain an argument in favour of the genuineness of Daniel. A prominent defender of the same cause is (or was till recently) head of the Criminal Investigation Department. The Bible Society can often get some successful and eminent administrator to take the chair at its meetings. If only Dr. Reich could have spared us the contemptuous epithets which he bestows on the specialists, he would have made a point likely to impress many readers.

Some of the remarks on language and languages are likely to meet with acquiescence, though a few are intentionally paradoxical, and it is not quite easy to distinguish jest from earnest. Thus on page 5 little gratitude is said to be due to "Grotefend and other ingenious contrivers" who have enabled us to read cuneiform; but on page 186 the Higher Critics receive their *coup de grace* from a copy of Genesis in cuneiform script, dating from the thirteenth or twelfth century B.C., that will "undoubtedly and in the near future" be unearthed. Such a document would be quite useless for the purpose of discrediting the Higher Critics, and indeed for any other, if no one could read cuneiform: one of these passages must therefore be in jest, and internal evidence is about equally divided in favour of either. On the other hand, the author seems rightly to emphasize the imperfection of modern acquaintance with the languages of the Old Testament, whether the evidence of Spinoza on the subject can be admitted at this time or not. The discovery of any continuous mass of Israelitish literature of almost any two or three centuries before Alexander would provide us with certainty, where we have to be content with ancient or modern hypotheses. If therefore the discovery of ancient literature is to be procured by prophecies of the sort quoted, Dr. Reich should be requested to foretell the discovery of some unknown Israelitish books, rather than of copies of existing works. They might not solve all the problems which criticism faces; but they would certainly solve some.

Some sympathy may also be felt with our author's complaints about the reduction to myth of characters regarded by the world not only as historical but as thoroughly known and understood. The loss to history of a personage so clearly painted as Joseph is certainly deplorable. The question is whether this result is the critic's misfortune or

his fault. The story of Joseph at each stage involves the belief in the prophetic character of dreams—his own, the chief baker's and the chief butler's and Pharaoh's. Is this principle, in Dr. Reich's opinion, so well attested by experience that such a career has none of the characteristics of fable? A word or two on this subject from him would surely have been in place.

Finally, it may be observed that the difference between Dr. Reich and those whom he attacks is much slighter than his language would suggest. His account, e.g., of the Pentateuch is that it was a *Gemeinde-Lesebuch*, "or popular work of edification in the hands of every one: . . . such a popular *Gemeinde-Lesebuch* must necessarily have undergone constant changes in its verbiage (phraseology), style, matter. Too many people handled it; too many copied it; too many different copies were extant in the various households. . . . A popular book of education, going through an untold number of copyists and generations, undergoing the greatest possible changes in form and structure, *if not also in its religious and historical essentials*, cannot now be reconstructed into its original constituent parts" (pp. 67-69). This result seems to give poor comfort to those who desire confirmation of their belief in the infallibility of Scripture. Higher Criticism, according to this, is a failure, not because it attempts to divide the indivisible, but because it would divide the infinitely divisible. Its enumeration of sources is not too large, but far too small. The follower of Wellhausen might perhaps suppose that J, E, P, etc., were authorized and competent persons; Dr. Reich's followers have not even this crumb of consolation.

The evidence, it may be observed, appears to be entirely against the simultaneous existence in ancient times of any great number of copies of the "Law." That our existing Hebrew copies are all derived from one is certain; from

Josephus it would appear that in his time each large community was possessed of a single copy; *the* copy captured by the Romans at Jerusalem afterwards came into his possession, and he does not suggest that he owned another. A copy was, it is stated, brought by Ezra to Jerusalem; a copy was discovered in Josiah's time. It is therefore improbable that the case is as bad as Dr. Reich represents: our existing Law is the result of a series of official recensions, several of them made when some national calamity had introduced considerable vagueness into the tradition, and all by persons whose critical methods differed widely from those now held in honour; the impossibility of unravelling the threads cannot be settled on *a priori* principles, but depends on the actual character of the materials. Even in a *Gemeinde-Lesebuch* this would hold good.

With regard to method also Dr. Reich's seems far nearer that of his opponents than that of the believers in literal inspiration. So he argues from the occurrence of monotheism in prophecy of 850 B.C. that the Exodus, which he puts about 1250 B.C., must have been historical; apparently (the steps are not easy to follow) because only so acute a national peril could have produced the intelligence requisite for the discovery of monotheism. The reconstruction of history on *a priori* principles is therefore common to Dr. Reich with his opponents, though few of them would venture to calculate back 400 years in this style. But if we turn to the Bible, it says nothing about national dangers abnormally developing the intelligence; the Abraham who arrives at monotheism by reflexion is a character of Josephus, not of Scripture; just as the Moses of Scripture is neither a general nor a legislator in our sense, but a passive agent, through whom a supernatural power works and speaks. Supposing therefore that Dr. Reich's historical argumentation could deduce a Moses and an Exodus, both

would necessarily be of a different sort from those of which the Bible speaks. So we might plausibly argue that living by an estuary produces great swimmers ; but this premise would be useless, if the historical fact which we desired to deduce were that some one crossed the Forth by the Forth Bridge Railway.

Parts of this book were originally delivered as lectures, and lectures often lose considerably by being printed. A number of personal matters which play a prominent part in an oration figure nowhere on the printed page. A printed discourse by Spurgeon is a poor reflex of the same as uttered by the great preacher. Hence we can well believe that much of this work was far more effective when heard than as read. In a future edition it may be hoped that the painful passages in which men of justly earned eminence are violently attacked may be omitted.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

*JEREMIAH'S JERUSALEM.**Circa 625-586 B.C.*

THE ministry of Jeremiah to Jerusalem covered as long and as critical a period of the City's history as did that of Isaiah and was exercised upon the same wide complex of affairs: the ethics, the worship, and the politics of her people. Isaiah and Jeremiah scourged the same vices, and enforced the same principles of righteousness. Both inveighed against prevalent idolatries; both wrought with reforming kings, who not only sought to extirpate the idols, but, for the further security of a pure faith, took measures to concentrate the national worship upon the Temple. As for politics, Jeremiah, as well as Isaiah, had to fight a party which intrigued for alliance with Egypt, to confront the armies of a northern empire, and to live with his city through the terrors of a siege.

In spite, however, of this outward resemblance, the respective attitudes of the two prophets towards Jerusalem were distinguished by inherent differences, which are perceptible even in the ethical tempers of their ministries, while in the political issues they become so wide as almost to appear irreconcilable. Ethically, Jeremiah was more rigorous and hopeless than Isaiah. The evil reign of Manasseh had come between and revealed the incorrigible bias of the people to idolatry and immorality. The efforts of Hezekiah to purify and concentrate the national worship did not succeed, and Isaiah was therefore spared the duty of criticising the popular effects of such measures. But Jeremiah lived through a reform and a centralization of the worship only to be confronted by their moral failure and their many abuses. In other words, while the one prophet led up to Deuteronomy, the ministry of the other

was compelled to lead away from Deuteronomy. Isaiah had interpreted to Jerusalem God's purpose in her selection by David and throughout her history since. It had been God's will to make Jerusalem *the City of Righteousness*; and even though she had failed of that ideal, she was still His dwelling, whose eternal throne the prophet saw behind the altar of her Temple; she was still, in a shaken and distracted world, the only refuge of His Remnant. Upon the faith roused by such visions, Isaiah, almost alone, carried the City inviolate through the Assyrian invasion; and her deliverance in 701 set God's signature to the interpretation which he had given of her history. But Jeremiah saw no visions of the unique sacredness of Jerusalem. His inaugural sacraments were provided not in the Temple, but in the open air of the country, to which he belonged: in a blossoming almond twig, and a boiling caldron with its face to the fateful north, out of whose smoke came actual, vivid heathen to set their thrones in the gates of Jerusalem. Hezekiah's efforts to translate Isaiah's ideals for the City into fact had failed, in spite of the miraculous attestation of her inviolableness, and had been succeeded by the relapse into the idolatries of Manasseh. Josiah's efforts, though more thorough and for a time successful, effected only a formal and unethical fulfilment of the prophetic ideals. Therefore where Isaiah had travailed with the hearts of his generation in order to prove that the City was sacred and impregnable to all the forces of the world; Jeremiah was compelled to contend with that superstition of her security, to which the faith of his great predecessor had been perverted by her people, and to proclaim as doomed to destruction what Isaiah had triumphantly saved. Isaiah inspired her timid king to defy the northern foes and tell them that God would turn them back before they touched her walls. Jeremiah had to scorn the immoral confidence of her citizens

in her invincibility, and to call the prophets false who predicted that she would survive.

It was not, however, only ethical reasons or disappointment with the effects of reform, which thus drove Jeremiah into an attitude towards Jerusalem so antithetic to that of Isaiah. The political situation had also changed. By Jeremiah's time Jerusalem was no longer that indispensable fortress of God's Remnant which the statemanship of Isaiah had seen her to be in the Assyrian world of his day. The empire, which now threatened Judah, bore a different policy to the victims of its sword. Conquest by Assyria had meant national annihilation. Northern Israel had not survived it, and we may be sure that if Jerusalem had fallen to Sennacherib in 701 Judah must have perished with her sister. But, with political insight equal to Isaiah's, Jeremiah perceived the wide difference of the Babylonian policy. This also meant exile for the peoples, whom its armies had conquered, but it did not involve their utter destruction. A nation uprooted from their own land might live still and even flourish when replanted in the soil of Babylonia, and surrounded by a political climate, which—we do not exactly know why—was more favourable to their survival than the Assyrian had been. So Jeremiah neither travailed for, nor predicted, the inviolableness of Jerusalem, but on the contrary counselled her surrender to the Chaldeans, advised her banished people to adapt themselves to their servitude, and foresaw with hopefulness their long residence in a foreign land.

All these are reasons why, while the watchword of Isaiah's ministry was the Remnant, secure upon their immovable City, that of Jeremiah's was the Return, after the City had been *wiped as a dish* and her people scattered among the nations.

I have hinted that one difference between the two

prophets was that of their local origins ; and the emphasis of this also must be put into our contrast. Isaiah was Isaiah of Jerusalem. The City was his platform, and the scenery of all his visions. He moved about her a free and commanding figure, sure of his influence upon her rulers, and with an imagination never more burning than when exercised upon her Temple and her walls. But Jeremiah was a countryman, whose earliest landscapes were the desert hills and stony fields of Benjamin with their agricultural shrines ; who found his first sacraments, as has been said, in the simple phenomena of rural life ; and whose youthful ears were filled, not like Isaiah's with the merrymaking of the crowds of *the jubilant City*, but with the cry of the defenceless villages. When at last Jeremiah came to the capital it was to see the Temple of Isaiah's vision turned into a fetish by the people ; it was to be treated as a traitor by her rulers ; it was to find in her his repeated prison. And even when the siege was close about the City, and the prophet himself shut up in the court of the guard, his hope was still anchored in the country. His pledge for the future of the nation he gave neither in the Temple nor in anything else of which Jerusalem boasted, but in the purchase from his uncle of one of the family fields in Anathoth : for his heart was set not upon the survival of civic or priestly glory, but on the restoration of agriculture throughout the land that was now desolate and in the hands of the foe.¹ We must count it one not only of the most pathetic but of the most significant episodes in this country-prophet's career that he should stake his hope upon those derelict acres. It was there, forty winters before, he had seen the almond tree flourishing, and knew that God was awake.²

Conformably to the lines of sympathy and experience,

¹ Ch. xxxii., especially verses 15, 41, 43 ff. (probably a later commentary on the episode), contrasted with 29 and 31.

² Ch. i, 11, 12.

which we have traced, the details of Jeremiah's treatment of Jerusalem arrange themselves as follows. Our only difficulties with regard to them are those which haunt the biographer of Jeremiah throughout especially the earlier portion of his life : the absence from the several oracles of dates and other means of fixing their chronological order, and the intrusion of so many titles, glosses and other later matter. Still, we can often mark whether an oracle was uttered before or after the prophet left Anathoth for Jerusalem ; whether an oracle implies the existence of the rural shrines or the effects of the Deuteronomic legislation ; whether the battle of Megiddo was past ; and whether the battle of Carchemish had been fought, that gave to the Babylonians the supremacy of Western Asia¹ and to Jeremiah himself the summit from which the course of events was at last clear to him. From the latter date, 604 B.C., when he dictated his earlier oracles to Baruch, and Baruch began to write his narratives, the exact years are either stated (not, however, always correctly) or clearly betrayed.

I. THE EARLY ORACLES OF JEREMIAH.

In what are apparently some of the earliest oracles of Jeremiah, now found in chapters ii.-iv.,¹ the prophet is engaged with the nation as a whole : her first loyalty to her God, her apostasy increasing from her entrance upon the Promised Land, and her present incredible misunderstanding of His ways with her. The name of Jerusalem either by itself or as preceding the rest of the land appears, almost exclusively, in such passages as (for other reasons) may be assigned to a later date.² It is the whole Israel or

¹ Erbt's arguments for a later date for chap. ii. (pp. 129, 235 ff.) are hardly sufficient.

² E.g., in the title ii. 2a, which is not found in the LXX., while the original oracle begins with 2b (*I remember the true love of thy youth, etc.*), and it is clearly not Jerusalem but the nation as a whole which is addressed (this against Erbt's *Jer. u. seine Zeit*, 128 f.) ; iii. 14-18, a passage which

Judah with which these early oracles deal.¹ If Jerusalem is mentioned it is as second to Judah,² or as the strongest of the fenced cities of the land,³ or as the public centre at which it was most natural to proclaim the message of the coming disaster.⁴ Throughout, the young Jeremiah has the unprotected villages on his heart and the interests of all *the townships of Judah*.⁵ The first outbreak of his anxiety for Jerusalem alone occurs at the end of this collection of oracles in one of the songs which has been reasonably assigned to the Scythian invasion (about 625): *the voice of the daughter of Sion gasping for breath, Woe is me, for it faileth, my life is the murderers'*.⁶

There are other oracles farther on in the Book, which are apparently as early as those in chapters ii.–iv., and here again the interest of the prophet is for all the townships of Judah,⁷ and the whole country,⁸ on which Jerusalem is conspicuous as the capital, but by no means of unique sacredness, for he names her as second to the country,⁹ as equally involved in the horrors of the impending invasion,¹⁰ and as certain of siege and destruction if her inhabitants do not repent.¹¹

plainly implies the exile; iv. 14, which I think Duhm is right in regarding as an interpolation, for it breaks the connexion and weakens the emphasis of the context.

¹ Addressed by name ii. 14, 28, 31; iii. 6–13 (this passage may not all be from Jeremiah), 20, 23; iv. 1; and implied elsewhere.

² *Men of Judah and Jerusalem*, iv. 3; *men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem*, iv. 4; *Declare in Judah and publish in Jerusalem*, iv. 5; *this people and Jerusalem*, iv. 11a (it is doubtful if the clause be original).

³ *Let us go into the fenced cities. Set up a standard towards Sion*, iv. 5, 6.

⁴ iv. 16. Even here Duhm elides the words *publish against Jerusalem*.

⁵ E.g. iv. 16. ⁶ iv. 31.

⁷ E.g. v. 17, x. 19–22 (apparently from the Scythian period).

⁸ xiv. 17, 18, xvii. 1–4 (probably from the Scythian period).

⁹ xi. 2, 6, 9, 12, 13, the account of the part assigned to Jeremiah in the promulgation of Deuteronomy. xiv. 2 ff.; 19 (denied to Jeremiah by both Duhm and Erbt).

¹⁰ vi. 23, ix. 16–21.

¹¹ vi. 1–8. But this passage, in which Jerusalem alone is dealt with,

To sum up—what Jeremiah has before him in these earlier oracles is the whole land of Judah, with its many shrines rank with idolatry, its rural landscapes and figures, its villages defenceless to the foe, and Jerusalem merely as the strongest, and most wicked, of its cities, to which the country folk flee before the invader, and which, as the climax of all, must fall before him. The passages of which Jerusalem forms the sole or the predominant subject are of later date.

II. AFTER THE INSTITUTION OF THE DEUTERONOMIC REFORMS.

In Chapter V. Jeremiah brings a searching indictment against all classes of the City's population. Duhm has imagined that the oracle marks Jeremiah's removal from Anathoth to Jerusalem, and that this therefore took place before the centralization of the national worship in the Temple in 620. But he forgets how close Anathoth lay to the capital and how familiar Jeremiah must have been with the citizens even before he became one of them. More probably the prophet's final migration to Jerusalem took place when the rural shrines, of which Anathoth was one, were abolished, and he and others of their priests were brought by Josiah to the Temple. However that may be, the effects of the centralization of the worship become very evident in the records of Jeremiah's activity as a prophet. After 620 he is able to address the whole manhood of the nation in the Temple Courts, as, obedient to Deuteronomy, they gather to the national festivals or fasts. For such addresses we are without any dates during the reign of Josiah. Hitzig, Keil and others have assigned

is more probably from a later period in the prophet's career, when either the Egyptians or the Babylonians were approaching, for the Scythians did not make such regular sieges as the one it describes. See below under III. and IV.

to the reign of Josiah chapter vii. 1-15, a passage which contains a speech by Jeremiah to *all Judah*¹ assembled in the Temple; distinguishing it from an address to *all the cities of Judah which are come to worship in Jahweh's house*, chapter xxvi. 1 ff., dated *in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim*. These two accounts, however, seem to refer to the same event. In any case the periodical gatherings in the Temple of all the men of Judah, which are enjoined by Deuteronomy, had become by the end of Josiah's reign so firmly established that they survived through the reign of his very differently minded successor; and Jeremiah used these gatherings in order to reach the national conscience. *Stand in the court of the house of Jahweh and speak to all the cities of Judah which are come to worship in the house of Jahweh.*² And again, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the prophet dictated his oracles to Baruch, he ordered him to read the roll of them *in the ears of the people in the house of Jahweh on a Fast-day, and also in the ears of all Judah who are come in from their cities.*³ The City in fact has become the *auditorium* of the nation. Yet even so, it is only because the nation gathers together upon the courts of her Temple that the prophet's activity is confined to her. In other words, he concentrates his teaching upon Jerusalem for practical and not for doctrinal reasons; and neither he himself nor his biographer, Baruch, give her any precedence (with perhaps one exception⁴) before the

¹ vii. 2. The shorter LXX. text is here to be preferred.

² xxvi. 2. The parallel passage in vii. 2 runs thus in the Hebrew text: *Stand in the gate of the house of Jahweh and proclaim there this word, and say, Hearken to the word of Jahweh, all Judah—ye that are entering by these gates to worship Jahweh; for which the LXX. has only Hear the word of Jahweh, all Judah.*

³ xxxvi. 6. Compare xxv. 1 f., where it is said that in the fourth year of Jehoiakim Jeremiah *spake with all the people of Judah and to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem.*

⁴ ix. 11 [Heb. 10]. *I will make Jerusalem heaps. . . and the cities of Judah a desolation.* The date of this verse and even its origin from Jeremiah himself is uncertain.

rest of the land. In the passages just quoted from xxv. and xxxvi., in chapter xiii., if this be genuine,¹ in chapter xiv., the Great Drought, and in the Parable of the Potter (chapter xviii.) and the Symbol of the Potter's Vessel (chapter xix.) the precedence of the Land to the City is constant, in spite of the fact that the national worship has already been concentrated in the City.²

Jeremiah's sermon, recorded in chapter vii. 1-15,³ reflects another result of the centralization of the worship: the popular perversion of the Deuteronomic insistence on the unique sacredness of Jerusalem. By the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim,⁴ and in all probability before this and during the reign of Josiah, the people had come to regard the Temple as a fetish. *Put not*, he says to the crowds assembled from all Judah in the Temple courts, *put not your faith in false words: "The Temple of Jahweh, the Temple of Jahweh, the Temple of Jahweh, there they are."*⁵ He turns his fellow-countrymen to the amendment of their ways. If they do justice between man and man, cease to oppress the orphan and widow and to shed innocent blood *in this place* and to go after other gods; then God will dwell with them in the place which He gave to their fathers. *Lo, ye are trusting to false words that profit nothing! Is it possible? Ye steal,*

¹ A difficult question, but on the whole Erbt's defence of it against Duhm seems to me strong.

² xiii. 9, 13; xiv. 2, 19; xviii. 11; xix. 7, 11; cf. xxv. 1, 18.

³ Duhm regards this passage as the work of a later expander of some genuine ideas of Jeremiah, obtained through Baruch's biography: "great thoughts, weakly elaborated." Duhm's view is governed by his quite unsubstantial theory that we have no genuine prose discourses from Jeremiah. Disallow this theory and there remains no objection to the substantial authenticity of ch. vii. The ideas are certainly Jeremiah's, and there is no improbability in his having expressed them in the then current and very infectious style of Deuteronomy.

⁴ Cf. with vii. 1-15 the date in xxvi. 1.

⁵ Literally "those." Cf. our Lord's words, Matt. xxiv. 1 and 2.

murder, commit adultery, perjure yourselves, sacrifice to Baal and go after other gods whom ye have not known, and then ye come in and stand before Me in this House, which is called by My Name, and say, "We have saved ourselves!"—in order to do all these abominations! Has this House become a den of thieves? ¹

The ecclesiastical ideals of Deuteronomy had been fulfilled, only to become a superstitious substitute for its ethical demands. The hard hearts of the people have made their obedience to its programme of ritual an atonement for their evil lives; and impiously congratulated their blood-stained and lustful hearts that they are as safe behind the sacred walls as the pure heart of Isaiah had known itself to be. To all that kind of sham there was but one end—the destruction of the abused sanctuary. For this there was a precedent. *Go now to my sacred place ² which was in Shilo, where at the first I caused My Name to dwell, and see what I have done to it for the wickedness of My people Israel. So now, because ye have done all these deeds (although I spoke to you in time, but ye hearkened not, and although I called you, and ye did not answer), I will do to the House which is called by My Name, in which ye put your trust, and to the sacred place which I gave to you and to your fathers, just as I have done to Shilo, and I will cast you out from My Presence just as I cast out all your brethren, the whole seed of Ephraim.*

We must not neglect to notice that on this occasion Jeremiah addressed himself not to the nation as a unit, as he had done in his earlier discourses and as the Book of Deuteronomy generally takes the nation, but to the separate individuals who compose it. This is clear from the parallel account in chapter xxvi. 3: *peradventure they will hear and turn, every man from his evil way;* and is in accordance with

¹ Cf. Mark xi. 15.

² מקדש here in the same sense as the Arabic Makam.

the increasing individualism of Jeremiah's ethics, when the failure of the national system of Deuteronomy became apparent and the collapse of the nation grew more certain.

Jeremiah's prediction of the destruction of the Temple in which the people trusted was addressed to practically the whole nation gathered to a Temple festival.¹ At its close the Temple prophets and priests² laid hold on him with the words, *Thou shalt verily die*. To them it was the sheerest sacrilege to say a word against either the Temple or the City. But the matter, being public, *for all the people were gathered to Jeremiah in the Temple*,³ the news of it speedily reached the nobles of Judah, and they came up at once from the palace to the Temple and took their seats *in the opening of the new gate of Jahweh*.⁴ The prophets and priests then formally accused Jeremiah before the nobles and the people of a capital crime in threatening *this City*.⁴ Jeremiah made a calm and dignified reply: Jahweh had sent him to prophesy against the Temple and the City; but there was still time to move God to relent if they amended their ways. As for himself he was in their hands, let them do what seemed good to them, only they must know that if they killed him they would bring the guilt of innocent blood upon themselves and the City, for in truth it was Jahweh who had sent him. The nobles and all the people then said he was not guilty of a capital crime, for he had spoken to them in the name of Jahweh; and some of the oldest of the men present testified to the assemblage that when Micah the Morasthite had proclaimed a destruction of the City and Temple, Hezekiah and the men of

¹ xxvi. 7.

² Verse 8. Omit the words *and all the people*, which have been wrongly repeated from verse 7.

³ Verse 9. But this clause really belongs to the following verse, and explains how the report quickly reached the nobles in the palace.

⁴ Verse 11. *The people* were therefore not among his accusers.

Judah instead of putting him to death had feared God and He had averted the disaster. This precedent prevailed with the people, and Jeremiah escaped. The king, who was absent on the occasion—it is remarkable that neither now nor in the events related in chapter xxxvi. is Jehoiakim present in the Temple—pursued even to Egypt another prophet who spoke as Jeremiah had done, and put him to death.

A short oracle by Jeremiah, chapter viii. 18–23, of very uncertain date,¹ quotes from the lips of the people an echo of the same superstitious perversion of Isaiah's belief in the unique sacredness of the Temple. Under some military disaster, imminent or actual, Jeremiah hears from the land far and wide, the perplexed cry: *Is there no Jahweh in Sion, is her King not in her?* Immediately the voice of God replies through him that He is offended and wearied by their much idolatry. This oracle, in its quotation from the lips of the people of what might have been the very words of Isaiah, is an instructive proof of how the pure, ethical faith of one generation may become the desperate fetish of the next.

III. OTHER ORACLES IN THE REIGN OF JEHOIAKIM.

The people's relapse into idolatry after the collapse of the Deuteronomic ideals in the disaster at Megiddo (608 or 607 B.C.) confirmed Jeremiah in his belief in the inevitableness of the destruction of Jerusalem. The battle of Carchemish in 604 or 603, in which Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon defeated Necho of Egypt, showed him clearly from what quarter that destruction could come. In the fact of the Potter at his wheel, changing his first plans for a lump of clay, as he finds it under his hand unsuitable to them,

¹ The various opinions of modern critics as to the date of the oracle are sufficient proof of the impossibility of assigning it with certainty to any of the main divisions of Jeremiah's career. In E.V. it is viii. 18, ix. 1.

chapter xviii. 1 ff.,¹ Jeremiah sees an illustration of how God may change His first purposes for Israel. Chapter xix., the account of how Jeremiah broke a potter's jar at the Gate Harsith, concentrates this lesson upon Jerusalem and the Temple.² The prophets of Jerusalem, now the religious centre of the land, are themselves immoral and the source of all the national sin.³ Therefore, Jeremiah is certain of her fall: *For who will pity thee, O Jerusalem? Or who shall bemoan thee? Or who shall turn to ask of thy welfare? Thou hast rejected Me, thou art gone back; so I have stretched out My hand against thee, and destroyed thee: I am weary with relenting.*⁴

From this time then, about 604 or 603 B.C., Jeremiah was certain of the fall of the City, which less than a century before Isaiah had so triumphantly saved. Nor had he any doubt of the quarter from which her executioner was to come. The battle of Carchemish left Nebuchadrezzar, the Chaldean, master of Western Asia.

From the want of a date it is impossible to say whether an oracle with so early a position in the Book as chapter vi. 1 ff., arose from this time: it describes enemies as besieging the City, who are certainly not the Scythians, for these appear not to have cast mounts or ramps against fortified places, but when they attacked them did so by "rushing" the walls. But the kind of siege described suited the Egyptians as well as the Babylonians; and the oracle is as dateable from the years immediately after Megiddo when

¹ Undated, but most probably from the reign of Jehoiakim.

² Also undated. Some place it in Jehoiakim's, some in Zedekiah's, reign. Duhm's objections to the authenticity of this narrative are arbitrary.

³ xxiii. 13-15. An oracle certainly to be dated after the centralization of the religion in Jerusalem, and probably in the reign of Jehoiakim, though some place it in Zedekiah's. Even Duhm admits this oracle to be by Jeremiah.

⁴ xv. 5-6.

Necho had Palestine in his power as from those after Carchemish when he had yielded this sovereignty to Nebuchadrezzar. But if, as I think reasonable, we are to allow that there are any genuine elements in chapter xxv. 1-14,¹ we have among them a distinct statement that Jerusalem shall fall to the king of Babylon. Jehoiakim seemed to have turned the edge of this sentence upon his capital by submission to Nebuchadrezzar, and remained his vassal for three years. Then he rebelled, and Judah was invaded by a Babylonian army aided by troops of Aram, Ammon and Moab. The country people and even such nomads from the desert as were in alliance with Judah, like the Rechabites, flocked for refuge to Jerusalem: an instructive illustration of how the population of the City was always increased upon the threats of invasion.² What happened to Jehoiakim himself is uncertain: from the Book of Kings³ we may infer that he died a natural death, while the statement in Chronicles⁴ that he was taken by the Babylonians and carried into exile, is difficult to reconcile with the fact that three months later Jerusalem, under Jeconiah, was besieged by Nebuchadrezzar himself, and almost immediately surrendered. The king, the royal family, and the court, with the flower of the population,⁵ were carried into Babylonia; and a further respite granted to Jerusalem herself under Mattaniah or Zedekiah, whom Nebuchadrezzar placed on the throne as his vassal.

IV. UNDER ZEDEKIAH.

To these events we have no reference by Jeremiah himself

¹ Cf. Giesebrecht on this passage.

² xxxv. : this chapter is dated in Jehoiakim's reign (verse 1). Many transfer it to Zedekiah's reign, 588-87. It is possible that the text gives a wrong date, like ch. xxvii. 1. But 2 Kings xxiv. 1 ff. describes a Chaldean invasion of Judah in Jehoiakim's days.

³ 2 Kings xxiv. 6.

⁴ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6; cf. Daniel i. 2; Jos. x. *Antt.* vi. 3.

⁵ Jeremiah xxiv. 1.

beyond a short elegy upon the exiled Jeconiah. Perhaps, as Erbt suggests,¹ till they were over the prophet remained hidden outside Jerusalem. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that he escaped the deportation of the notables of the City to Babylonia.

Zedekiah, whom Nebuchadrezzar installed in place of Jeconiah, was master neither of his throne nor of himself. A vassal, in the hand of his powerful lord, yet constantly goaded to revolt by his neighbours and a restless faction of his own subjects; deprived of the strongest of his people and dependent upon a council of inexperienced upstarts, yet tempted to rebel by the strength of his walls and the popular belief in their inviolableness; sensitive, if only from superstition, to the one high influence left him, yet urged in a contrary direction by prophets who appealed to the same God as Jeremiah did—the last king of Judah is one of the most pathetic figures even in her history and forms a dramatic centre for its closing tragedy.

During the first years of his reign there was nothing for Zedekiah and his people but to remain submissive to their Babylonian lord. This was in agreement with the convictions of Jeremiah, and therefore these years bring us no record of action by him, unless we are to assign to them any of those denunciations of idolatry which he is usually supposed to have published under Jehoiakim. As in the time of Manasseh, the servitude to a heathen Empire involved the admission to the national sanctuary of the gods of that Empire. Ezekiel² gives us a picture of the Babylonian idolatry which invaded the Temple under Zedekiah, and to which it is possible that some of Jeremiah's descriptions of the worship of *the host of heaven* may refer. Ezekiel also describes Jerusalem as full of moral wrong and the stupid

¹ p. 19.

² Ch. viii.

pride of the baser people left to her. They, forsooth, were Jahweh's true remnant, because they alone were spared to the City!¹ They had usurped the offices and the estates of their exiled countrymen; and were full of the arrogance of the upstart and of those who, having been saved only because of their inferiority, impute their salvation with equal folly either to their own merits or to the special favour of Heaven. Their self-confidence grew, till it inevitably turned upon its patron, and, fortified by proposals from others of his vassals, began to intrigue against Nebuchadrezzar.

It is at this point that the record of Jeremiah's public ministry is resumed. Ambassadors having arrived from Moab and Ammon, Tyre and Sidon—perhaps in the fourth year of Zedekiah, that is 593,²—Jeremiah was directed to meet their proposals for common revolt against Babylon by making yokes for himself and them, as symbols that the Babylonian yoke would not be broken. But the party of revolt had also its prophets who spake in the name of Jahweh, and we can easily understand how sincerely these men felt the truth of their message. Jahweh was Judah's God, who had already delivered her from an invader as powerful as the Babylonian. In affirming that He would do so once more these prophets were not only inflamed by a fanatic

¹ Ch. xi. 15; cf. Jeremiah xxiv.

² Jeremiah xxvii., xxviii., xxvii. 1, which fixes the date of these events in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, is both a late addition (which the LXX. Version is still without) and a false one: as even our English Revisers allow themselves to affirm, substituting on the margin the name of Zedekiah for that of Jehoiakim, and appealing to verses 3, 12, 20, and xxviii. 1. Chaps. xxvii.—xxix. form a group by themselves, being distinguished by certain literary characteristics from the rest of the Book of Jeremiah. But xxvii. also differs much from xxviii.; it is more diffuse, and its Hebrew text contains many additions, whose style no less than their absence from the Greek version prove them to be late. In xxvii., too, Jeremiah is introduced in the first person, while in xxviii. he appears in the third. In the text above use is mainly made of xxviii. The date suggested for the events of which both chapters treat, the 4th year of Zedekiah, is by no means certain.

patriotism and a mere military confidence in the nation's Divine leader. No doubt they desired as much as Jeremiah himself did to banish from Jahweh's Temple the foreign gods and their impure rites. Thus it was a very plausible opposition with which Jeremiah was confronted, and the way in which he dealt with it, not quite sure at first whether it might not be genuinely inspired of Jahweh, forms one of the most interesting episodes in the whole history of prophecy. Only observe how, unlike his contemporary Ezekiel, he is utterly indifferent to the part that the question of the Temple plays in the controversy. This is to be solved, he feels, by no dogmas connected with the Temple or the Law, but upon principles which are purely ethical and political.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

(To be continued.)

*TURNING THE HEARTS OF THE CHILDREN
TO THEIR FATHERS.¹*

“He shall turn the heart of the children to the fathers.”—MAL. iv. 6.

“He shall turn the disobedient to walk in the wisdom of the just.”—
St. LUKE i. 17 (R.V.).

IN the second of these two texts we have evidently St. Luke’s view of the inner meaning of the Prophet. Malachi tells us that the alienation of children from pious and virtuous parents is alienation from God; and the restoration of such children by the “Elijah Mission” is restoration to God. Bad family life becomes bad national life, and thus brings upon a whole land the worst of interdicts—the ban and interdict of God.

The great object of the “Mothers’ Union” is the elevation of family life by the elevation of Motherhood. I desire on this occasion to speak of the help given to Christian mothers in the New Testament, by one example and one lovely sketch.

I.

The example to which I refer is that of the Mother of Jesus. And, indeed, the value of her witness to the Incarnate depends upon *that*.

How did the third Evangelist know about the idyll of Bethlehem? It is a question which is often asked now.

St. Luke’s was at least the mind of a real historian. Dr. Lightfoot says “the Acts probably affords greater means of testing its general character for truth than any other ancient narrative in existence, and in my opinion it satisfies the tests fully.”²

He therefore used documents. One has only to think

¹ A sermon preached in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, November 24, 1905; addressed to the members of the Mothers’ Union.

² *Epistle to Galatians*, p. 331.

of the letter of Lysias and the particulars of the narrative of the Ephesian riot.

Let us ask ourselves who are the best historians of childhood and children.

In humble homes there is often a child with big lustrous eyes, who utters strange sayings. The mother of such a child may be vulgar and commonplace. Such mothers have a memory which may remind us of a garden wheelbarrow—loaded with rubbish, but with beautiful flowers upon the top. Her child's sayings and doings are the flowers upon this mother's memory, and they are wet with drops from heaven. May we not see in those precious records in the first two chapters of St. Luke the hand and heart of the mother of Jesus ?

Let me recall to you a passage in the earliest Gospel, the second synoptical Evangelist. Those nearest to Jesus formed the design of laying some restraint upon that self-consuming energy. We are told vividly of the coming of His brethren and His mother, standing without and sending to Him. Think of the words which were uttered by Him—"Who is My mother, or My brethren?" "Behold My mother, and My brethren—for, whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother." By a "Holy Family" we generally understand an Italian masterpiece of painting. But our Lord gives us something far larger and nobler. Whoever has Christ's likeness in the soul; whoever has the tremulous tones of His voice, and the gentle look of His face; whoever is ready, as far as in him lies, to wash every foot that is sullied with earth's dust, and to heal every foot that is stabbed with earth's thorns, is like His sister in self-devoted purity; like His brother in passions mastered, and selfishness cast out (like James, the brother of Jesus, as revealed to us in his Epistle by his great commentator—storing up His

words and repeating His ideas, until all his writing is spangled with them, as a tract of sky with stars);—nay, like His mother, in a birth of Jesus in a soul. We have heard much of the “Nelson-touch” lately. Mothers! it is hardly an exaggeration to say, that with you, under God, it may rest whether your children shall have “the Christ-touch” or not.

So far help in one example of the New Testament has been spoken of. How much remains to be said of womanly heroism, serene patience, deep thoughtfulness! One can say with some allowance for imagination, Wordsworth’s beautiful sonnet upon “The Virgin”; but the first two lines must be excluded by us.

Woman! whose virgin bosom was unhurt
By the least shade of thought to sin allied.

You can read the commentaries of two great lights of the Eastern and Western Churches upon the Marriage Feast at Cana. It has been beautifully said by an eminent living theologian, that when Mary seemed to interfere in her Son’s appointed work, she was “*gently waived aside*” by her Divine Son.

The two Fathers to whom I have referred go a good deal further!

II.

So far, I have spoken of help to mothers in one example in the New Testament.

Let us now look at the lovely sketch in St. Peter’s First Epistle (iii. 1 sqq.).

Take such points as these—

“Beholding”; the word means, literally, “initiation into a mystery,” a secret unknown to those to whom Christianity is unknown. “Chaste conversation coupled with fear”; surely that cannot mean continuing fear of a husband; but timidity which fears any fleck or spot

upon so white a thing—an ever-tremulous purity. The great Latin historian showed a fine appreciation when he said of a Roman lady, “she danced with more studied attractiveness than quite beseemed a Roman matron.” Look carefully at St. John’s Second Epistle. It is a little feather in the great cloud of feathers ever blown about by the world’s posts ; but it is a little golden feather from an eagle’s wing !

Such are examples from the New Testament ; such the Galilean fisherman’s ideal of what beseemed a lady of station, when Poppea was Nero’s empress. And from this the long procession of Shakespeare’s heroines ; the exquisite sweetness and pathos of Wordsworth’s “Lucy.” “A dream of Fair Women ” is a poet’s fine fancy ; a real union of good women is the world’s best hope of a regenerated human society.

Such a work as the “Mothers’ Union ” finds—I will not say its best or most fitting context—but a good and fitting context in that part of the Divine society to which we belong. What links in a golden chain are the Baptismal Service ; the dear, wise old Catechism ; the Confirmation Service, with its seven “for evers !” How well I remember, in the Revision Committee, the great and good Bishop O’Brien detailing the story of his prolonged grappling with the subject, and how he came to his ultimate view. I can see him, his tall frame bent, twisting a pen round and round. The Baptismal gospel was, he said, the key of the Church’s view—very young children brought for a blessing. That blessing was, he said, individual, impartial, real, continuing—to each and all ; not this to one and that to another—indefinable ; yet *a true gift, no mockery* ; and the beginning of a mode of dealing which is the same for ever with Him who is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, and called, in the language of the Church, *regenera-*

tion. And thus *infant*, rather than *adult*, is the norm of the idea of Baptism.

It is, I repeat, a fit beginning for the Elijah Mission, which is for turning "the hearts of children to their fathers."

III.

So far, we have spoken of the elevation of family life by the elevation of Motherhood ; and help in the New Testament by characters and by sketches so lovely as that of St. Peter.

But something more remains to be said.

Three objects of the Mothers' Union are specifically laid down : the deepening sense of marriage sanctity ; the recognition of parental responsibility to children ; the organizing bands of mothers in all churches of our communion for united prayer and communication. At the beginning of the year the members associated in this work were 235,000 ; probably by New Year's Day they may be close to 300,000. Truly there is a sense in which we may say—"The Lord gave the word : great was the company of those who published it ; she that tarried at home divided the spoil."

Does not the text give a hint of the duty of children to their parents ?

The duty of children to their parents is given in a very downright form by St. Paul : "Children ! obey your parents in the Lord." I know that he proceeds to remind them that the fifth commandment is the first commandment with promise, and is the first in the second table. I know that he adverts to the blessing incident upon the obedience, "that it may be *well* with thee" ; and at the word "*well*," the most pregnant of all commentators cries, "*attende, juventus !*" But St. Paul, at the beginning, confines himself to one small word—"right"—"for this is *right*."

Surely it is a good thing to have duty put fair and square, with no glitter of glory, or flash of flamboyant eloquence. Men declaim most about those virtues which they practise least. Of all varieties of coxcombs, the ethical coxcomb is perhaps the most mischievous. Bishop Butler says in immortal words: "Going over the theory of virtue in one's thoughts, talking well, and drawing fine pictures of it; this is so far from necessarily, or certainly, conducing to form a habit of it in him who thus employs himself, that it may harden the mind in a contrary course, and render it gradually more insensible; that is, form a habit of insensibility to all moral considerations." This proposition he proceeds to establish by one of the most perfect arguments in the science of morals. Unreality, like hypocrisy, delights in the most sublime speculations; for never intending to go beyond speculation, it costs nothing to have it magnificent. A novel of the day gives us a powerful illustration of this. A man who is actually on his way to do the foulest wrong to a friend, and who at that moment is walking with the same friend, sees this in a street of London—an emaciated and bedraggled woman, with an enormous bundle of clothes to be carried for a considerable way. The man with the sinful intention so near to his heart calls a cab, thrusts the bundle into it, and puts the woman into the cab, with a fantastical chivalry. The ethical coxcomb has habitually two fatal errors working in his heart; the first of these errors is vanity. He wishes to be observed, and to win the D.S.O. in the Army of Virtue. The second error is apt to be one of the crudest and most misleading errors of the doctrine of supererogation. He thinks that he gains the right to do far less than the simplest duty in one respect, because in another he has done something splendidly beyond his duty. The most fearfully ironical of any page of English is that in which a generally delightful writer addressed these questions

to a man of remarkable genius. "Whether the Seraphim do not transact their virtue by way of vision? Whether 'practice' be not a sub-celestial, and merely human virtue? Whether an immortal human soul may not come to be damned at last, and the man never suspect it?"¹ Now our blessed Lord Himself speaks with scathing irony of what was probably an ethical coxcombry of this kind. "Moses said, 'Honour thy father and thy mother'; but ye say, 'If a man shall say to his father or mother, "That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me, is corban"—that is to say, given to God—ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or for his mother.'" It is of this that He says, "Full well do ye reject the commandment of God. . . ." *Full-well!*² it is one of the words used with the deepest and most scathing irony. The transgressor in such cases was, no doubt, in many cases, an ethical coxcomb, who desired to find means for a popular form of virtue, and to think no more about his homely duty.

Let me give (though it does not come under this division), a specimen of difference in a father's and mother's duty. The first is, the duty of a father when a boy goes to a public school. The father can enter into many details, kindly as well as wisely. There are people who would say to such a father, "You may put evil into the boy's head." Perhaps—but the first bad boy whom the lad meets may put it into his heart, which is rather worse. The other instance to which I refer is that of a mother. A great preacher and writer has said, that the best and only safe confessional is, as a general rule, in a mother's room.³ Perhaps some young person has memories which make her face flush, and her heart beat; she thinks about her secret; she says to

¹ Lucas, *Life of C. Lamb*, i. 133.

² καλῶς.

³ Dean Vaughan, *Authorised or Revised*,

herself, "How dare I tell my mother, she hates this so!" Perhaps so, but she hates concealment more, so that one's advice in any such case would be, "My daughter, go to the best confessor for you—go to your mother and tell her."

It seems to be by the Mothers' Union that the "Elijah Mission" may best be fulfilled, if I have given you the right interpretation of the text. Melancthon tells a touching story in one of his letters. A little child of his, "*Infantula mea*," he calls her, came in unnoticed when her father was silently weeping, and wiped off his tears with her bib. This, says Melancthon, pierced my very soul. Is not this one way in which the hearts of the children are turned to their fathers?

WILLIAM ARMAGH.

THE FAITHLESSNESS OF THE AVERAGE MAN.

(MATTHEW XXV. 18, AND XXIV. 30.)

THE trend of this parable is surely not in the way of our familiar and customary thought. The popular indictment is hurled against the culpability of the rich, the lazy and criminal indifference of the much-endowed. We are prone to shake our heads over the failings and the failures of the children of advantage, the luxurious waste of the well-to-do. It is the wilfulness and degeneracy of the man with the five talents which is usually depicted by our novelists, and the man with the one talent is made to climb the shining gradient of honour and renown. But this parable of the Lord enshrines the impeachment of the average man. The outstandingly gifted man, the five-talented man, does his work and wins his crown. It is the average man, the mediocre man, the man without brilliance and prominent parts, the one talent man, who shirks his responsibility, and buries his powers in a self-made grave. Our Lord indicts the

common man, not leaders and captains and commanders, but the men of the rank and file. In this parable it is mediocrity that runs away from its appointed task. The popular emphasis must be changed, and we must clearly recognize that one of the great weaknesses of the world lies in the faithlessness of the less-endowed man. It is easy to recognize the responsibility which attaches to five talents; it requires a far finer moral perception to see the responsibility which attaches to one. Anybody can see the obligation which attends upon eloquence: how few recognize the obligation which belongs to ordinary speech! A man goes to be minister at some conspicuous Church, and many of his friends write to him emphasizing the vast responsibility he has assumed. How few of them would have used the same emphasis had he been going to minister to a handful of shepherds in some secluded Bethel on some far-stretching moor! We can all see the responsibility that waits upon prominence, but who can see her austere form when she is the attendant of obscurity? It is to correct that negligence, that lack of fine discernment, that this parable was spoken. It proclaims the responsibilities, and therefore the perils, of the commonplace, and it points out the far-reaching destiny which awaits the actions of those who are not gifted with the five-fold crown.

Now let us look at this tragic story, the history of a man who began life with a fair, if slender, endowment, and who ended his days in spiritual darkness and bankruptcy. Where did he begin to go wrong? Where did he take the first turning to his ill-starred destiny? He first went wrong in his perverse and unworthy thinking about himself. It is freely admitted by the Master that his endowments were not conspicuous and obtrusive. His equipment was not so brilliant as the man who had obtained the five talents. And it is just here that his reasoning went astray. He

began to make comparisons between himself and others. He marked the versatility of their gifts, the high positions into which they stepped with natural ease, and the popular acclaim which attended their goings. And because he lacked their brilliance, he despised his own gift. Now comparisons are commonly odious, but in this sphere they are more than odious, they are fraught with dire and speedy peril. We cannot safely make disparaging comparisons between showy gifts and gifts of a quieter hue. How can we compare candles and stars? One moves in a firmament, the other dwells in a scullery: but each has its own peculiar and distinctive ministry, and if I want to find my way in obscure and winding cellarings I prefer the flicker of the friendly candle to the exalted radiance of the star. We cannot all be stars, but it is essential to remember that if we are only common candles a ministry has been committed to us of which the star itself has been deprived. There are services committed to the man with the one talent in which the five-talent man would be altogether incompetent. Why, then, sit down and indulge in self-disparaging comparisons, the hen envying the eagle, and the useful vegetable coveting the glory of the resplendent rose? But this, indeed, is where our man's mistake began. He became fascinated with the glamour of the more obtrusive gift, and so he disparaged and despised his own.

But he not only ignored the unique ministry of the individual gift, he absolutely ignored the law of mental and spiritual increase in obedience to which a slender gift becomes enlarged. He wanted a harvest without husbandry, he wanted multiplication without work. He overlooked the great law that gift is increased by faithfulness, and that expert power is acquired in the ways of obedience. "Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things." That is not an arbitrary addition,

a kind of capricious appendix which may or may not be reached. It is a natural and inevitable harvest, as sure as the life and love of God. One talent faithfully used becomes two ; two talents become four ; and so on in never-ending multiplication through all the evolving glory of the endless years. That is the vast and alluring prospect of the immortal hope. Through ever-added obedience we shall attain to ever-intensified gift, and in the ever-enlarging perception heaven will be to us a ceaseless surprise ! Such is the law of increase, and it operates here and now. This man ignored it. Because he had not a great capital he would not work with the little he had. Because he could not open shop in the Metropolis he would have nothing to do with his native village. And so he let his capital lie idle. He allowed his gift to rust. His life was uninvested, unused in the general currency of the world's affairs. " He went away, and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money." He went through his days regarding himself as poor, and shrinking from every call to service on the plea of humility, and ever affirming that he had nothing wherewith to serve the race. And all the time there was that grave he had dug, and in it his Master's buried money, which, if it had been brought out and used, would have been enriching his kind all along the way. " But no ! " he said, " it is only one ! " If it had been five, he would have opened a banking account ! But he said, " It is only one, what is the use of it ? " And that is the colossal misreckoning which renders countless multitudes of mediocre lives ineffective and fruitless. " It is only one ! " Nay, it is " only one " plus the Giver of it, the Lord of power and glory ! This is the line of high and inspiring reasoning : it speaks in this wise :—" Here is my one talent, my little-endowed and commonplace life ; but what cannot my Lord do with it if I wholly dedicate it to His service ? "

We are not to limit our possibilities to the measure of the five loaves ; we have the five loaves plus the Lord of the Harvest, and it is in this Divine combination that we attain the possibility of feeding the multitude. The man of the parable fixed his eyes upon the five loaves and ignored the possibility of an immediate harvest. He gazed at his little talent and he left out God.

Now our thoughts never travel alone. Every thought is attended by its own retinue of thoughts which follow in its train. This man's personal thought of his own useless mediocrity was creative of moral neglect. That is to say, his thought fashioned his habit. But habit itself is reactive and is the minister and creative of thought. His customary indolence, born of unwise self-disparagement, will itself become a fashioner of thought and so help the creation of further habit. What kind of mental influence will be engendered by his moral indolence ? How will he think of God ? Neglect of duty will always operate in shaping and colouring our thoughts of the Divine. Let us trace this man's reasoning. He said to himself, " I have but little capital ; with so small an endowment I can achieve nothing ! " And so with that conception he attempted nothing. But it was whispered to him that God will expect a return. " A return ? Then He is a hard man ! He expects a harvest where He gave no seed ! He reaps where He has not sown, and He gathers where He has not strawed ! He looks for interest, and He gave no capital ! He expects much, and He gave nothing ! " Such is the heated and peevish indictment which arises from a life that is moving in the ways of moral negligence. " Lay the blame on God ! " " Thou art a hard man ! " How perverse is the reasoning ! But whenever there is dirt in the heart there will be dust in the eyes. There is a vast amount of perverse thinking about God which arises from the

degeneracy of an uninvested life. There is nothing so strengthens and clarifies our thought of the Almighty like the faithful and scrupulous discharge of duty. "If any man will do the will, he shall know . . ." Every talent, wisely invested, increases the depth and range of our spiritual perceptions. But if our talents are laid aside in indolence, we are burying the very lenses through which we are to perceive and interpret the things of God. "Eyes have they, but they see not."

Let us follow on with the dark succession. We cannot keep our thoughts in one compartment and our emotions in another. We are not built in isolated sections, one section existing in utter aloofness from the other. Man's primary thoughts inevitably influence his basal emotions, and in the experience of this particular man they roused the ministry of fear. "I was afraid." Not that he was terrified, but that he was possessed by a shrinking unwillingness to think of God at all. If any of his friends guided the conversation in the direction of the Highest, this man would adroitly turn the subject. It was with the utmost difficulty that the thought of the Almighty was obtruded into any intercourse with him. Anything but that! He became like unto those of whom the Apostle Paul speaks in the Epistle to the Romans. "They refused to have God in their thoughts." The element was uncongenial, and in its presence he became the child of anxiety and unrest. And that is how it is with multitudes of people whose Divine endowment is rusting, and who have not enlisted their strength in the common service. Their alienation from the Lord is reflected in their unwillingness to think about Him and to welcome any thoughts of His appearing. If we were morally and spiritually healthy, we should recall the thoughts of God as fervently and joyfully as a faithful husband recalls the thought of his loving and devoted wife. And yet mark the issue of the fear. It

accomplished nothing of moral amendment. It may have occasionally moved him to pray, or even led him to some place of public worship, although I rather think that it more commonly led him to bury himself in deeper alienation from his Lord. Fear is no minister of consecration. The neglect was continued. Nay, he dug the grave a little deeper, and hid his Lord's money in a more selfish and corrupting indolence.

But now, where is all this to end? What of the Nemesis of destiny? We cannot bury our talents and keep them. In God's universe there is a law of degeneracy and decay as well as a law of renewal and progress, and buried wealth always becomes the victim of corruption. "Take from him the talent!" That is no arbitrary decree. Nor is it a judgement proclaimed in some solemn and ultimate hour when we appear in the immediate presence of God. That supreme season is always present. "Now is the judgement." The forces of corruption are at work upon the talent from the first moment of its burial. We begin to lose it the very moment we cease to use it. The life that bears no interest shall lose its capital too! "From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." If we live a life of thoughtless selfishness, all the altruistic tendrils in our soul will begin to wither away. That is an awful and appalling possibility. A man may begin his life with a little capital and he may end it with no capital at all.

"And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness." Again, I say, this is no arbitrary and capricious judgement. If we blow out our lights, if we quench and smother them in selfish and thoughtless indolence, what else can we expect but the darkness? It is beautiful, when men grow old, to watch how every talent, having been well and wisely used, burns and shines like a lamp. It is beautiful to see such men in their eventide, every room in their life

lit up, the house resounding with music, and everything ready for the coming of the King. But it is pathetic and chilling to see men arrive with their lights out, already in the darkness, already in the desolation which is the doom of those who live in idle alienation from God. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." I have nothing to say about that. I will leave the words just as they stand. Those tears, those bitter tears, falling in the night, the night of abiding remorse! I will leave it there. The life, which began in foolish self-disparagement, ends in dark and wintry bankruptcy.

J. H. JOWETT.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

P'S GENEALOGICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL LISTS.

It has long been the accepted view of Old Testament scholars that the numbers of the Israelites during their journey from Egypt into Palestine are devoid of historical value. But few serious attempts have been made to discover their origin and the system upon which they were based, and their seeming verisimilitude has not infrequently been taken as proof of their genuineness. It was recognized (by Nöldeke) that a round total of 600,000 was divided among the twelve tribes, and so manipulated that half should be over and half under the average number, and B. Jacob has recently made a comprehensive examination of the principles which appear to have been employed. In *Der Pentateuch : Exegetisch-kritische Forschungen* (Leipzig) he discusses the passages in the Pentateuch wherein tribal lists and enumerations occur, and finds throughout the same artificial, or, to use his term, arithmetical treatment. He illustrates by this means the favourite use of the numbers 7, 12 and 70, which underlie the system, and collects numer-

ous examples, many of which of course are familiar, in order to support his conclusion that it is arithmetic and not history which accounts for the present form of many of the obscure lists. According to him, if it were proposed to divide twelve by two, the writers preferred to choose $5 + 7$, $4 + 8$, or even $3 + 9$, never, or rarely, $6 + 6$; and since this method is found to be generally applicable, the fact that there are no instances of 100 or 800 or 900 in the census lists of the Israelites finds an explanation. Similar artificiality runs through the chronology of the book of Genesis, and Jacob discovers interesting coincidences upon which he founds his theory of the origin of the system. He finds that, according to the traditional view, the tower of Babel was built in A.M. 1974, and that exactly half this number is the year of Enoch's translation; successive periods each of 480 years from man's attempt to reach heaven mark the building of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the founding of the temple at Jerusalem, and the return from exile. In addition to this, the earlier history has been classified and arranged to conform outwardly with the later, and the critical view which questions the trustworthiness of the former is accepted. On the other hand, Jacob argues for an early origin of the system and regards his calculations as a proof of the purity of the Hebrew text.

THE COSMOLOGICAL THEORY.

Jacob, moreover, discovers that the same artificial treatment pervades the Pentateuchal narratives which deal with the tabernacle and the ritual. Without passing any opinion upon the character of his investigations, it is enough to state that he is led to an extremely interesting result, no other, indeed, than an approximation to the cosmological theory which has lately attained some prominence among certain continental writers. One must not ignore the fact

that Jacob's studies are in many respects uncritical, and that the theory in question has even been regarded as a universal "key" to the elucidation of ancient Oriental thought; but, writing as he does from the semi-traditional standpoint, his recognition of the theory alone is illustrative of a tendency in present Old Testament study which deserves serious consideration. It cannot be altogether ignored that an excessively puzzling Phoenician inscription from Sidon was recently interpreted in a cosmical sense by the French archaeologist, Clermont-Ganneau, quite independently and in ignorance of the existence of this new "key." Winckler's theory has been taken up by von Landau, and has been further investigated by A. Jeremias, with particular attention to the New as well as to the Old Testament; and although it has suffered from the excess to which all "systems" are inevitably pushed, the independent support of the French savant and of Jacob appears to invest it with more value than one has hitherto been disposed to grant. Obviously, it is a subject in which Assyriologists are primarily concerned, and independent Assyriological guidance is requisite. But as regards the Old Testament, there is little doubt that the tradition prevailed that the tabernacle of the wilderness had a heavenly prototype, and in so far as this conception finds its logical development in the Book of Jubilees, there appears to be no objection to the recognition of the theory in its less unattractive forms.

Wellhausen criticises Niese's view of the relative historical value of 1 and 2 Maccabees in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1905, pp. 117-163. 1 Maccabees, on the whole, is in his opinion the better source, but 2 Maccabees offers many supplementary details and corrections, and is therefore important. He regards both as independent works, the differences are not always so bad as they appear, and the points of agreement are often very striking. He supports the view of an original

Hebrew version of 1 Maccabees, and gives a typical list of passages where the hypothesis enables the present text to be corrected. Thus, Apollonius the "collector of tribute" (1 Macc. i. 29), elsewhere *ὁ Μυσάργχης* (2 Macc. v. 24), owes the designation to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew *מס*. In 1 Maccabees vi. 34, they "shewed" the elephants, has arisen from *הראו*, which ought naturally to be *הרוו*, "they made the elephants intoxicated," etc. Wellhausen reviews Laqueur's study in *G.G.A.* pt. iv. pp. 334 sqq.

Maspero, in a discussion of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties of Egypt after Manetho (*Rec. de Travaux*, xxvii. 1-2), calls attention to the mixture of history and fiction which characterizes that writer, and shows that his lists rest upon a tradition fundamentally different from that in the Theban official canon. The interest taken in early Egyptian history by Greeks and Jews settled in Egypt is held to be largely responsible for the growth and modification of the early traditions, and accounts for Manetho's curious combination of the domination of the Hyksos and the ephemeral conquest of the valley by Syrians towards the end of the nineteenth dynasty.

C. Steuernagel, in the *Theologische Rundschau*, Sept., criticises the three recent commentaries on the middle books of the Pentateuch by Bäntsch, Gray, and Holzinger. He notes the agreement between them as regards the separation of JE from P, and maintains his view that the passages relating to Israel, east of the Jordan, belong to the Elohist or Ephraimite traditions. He holds that in the Yahvist or Judaeon cycle the oldest account of the spies was originally followed by the attack upon the Canaanites of the Negeb and subsequently by the entrance into Palestine, fragments of which have survived in Judges i.

In the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, No. 3, D. H. Müller discusses the relation between Zephaniah iii. 1-4, 7 sqq. and

Ezekiel xxii. 24-31, and argues that Ezekiel is the borrower, the linguistic indications in Zephaniah *l.c.* which have been taken to point to a late date not being decisive.

Hubert Grimme, *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*, October, 1905, proposes an ingenious theory with regard to the date and authorship of Ecclesiastes. He finds remarkable parallels between Ecclesiastes ix. 7-9 and the Gilgamesh-epic to the extent that he regards them as mutually explanatory, emending, for example, חיים in v. 9 to בנים on the strength of the Babylonian story; vi. 10 he refers to Ashurbani-pal, and the child on the throne, x. 16 seq., to Labashi-Marduk. After noticing several references, and the loan-words of Babylonian origin, he concludes that the book belongs to the time of Jehoiachin. He finds no difficulty in the linguistic character of Ecclesiastes which has usually been regarded as one argument in favour of its late origin.

STANLEY A. COOK.

JEREMIAH'S JERUSALEM.

(Continued.)

WHEN Jeremiah was going about with the bar upon his neck he was met by a *prophet*, Hananiah ben-Azzur, who in the name of Jahweh told him that the Babylonian yoke would be broken, Jeconiah be restored, and the sacred vessels be brought back which Nebuchadrezzar had carried away. Jeremiah did not contradict this, but prayed that it might be as Hananiah said, and solemnly left the question between them to the issue of events ; evidently in doubt for the moment as to whether the word of Jahweh was with himself or with the other. The confident Hananiah broke the bar on Jeremiah's neck, the symbol of the Babylonian yoke, *and the prophet Jeremiah went his way*. Later, Jeremiah's confidence was restored. He denounced Hananiah as false, and—in the spirit of Deuteronomy itself—predicted his death.¹ Thenceforth he remained constant in his conviction that the only hope for Judah was in submission to the Babylonian. If Zedekiah revolted, Jerusalem must fall.

If the date we have assumed for this episode be correct, Zedekiah did not venture to break his homage to Nebuchadrezzar for four or five years. But in 588 a new monarch ascended the throne of Egypt, Hophra² by name, and began to interfere in the politics of Palestine. The Egyptian party in Jerusalem found its opportunity and Zedekiah appears to have come to an understanding with the Pharaoh.³

¹ The verses stating this are doubted by some critics.

² "The Hebrew transcription is rather exact," W. M. Müller, *Enc. Bibl.* col. 2107. Herodotus : Ἀπρῆς. He is the Pharaoh of Jer. xxxvii. 5, 7, 11.

³ Ezek. xvii. 15.

Against this coalition, Nebuchadrezzar moved south in person, and established his headquarters at Riblah on the Orontes. On the 10th day of the 10th month of the 9th year of Zedekiah, January 588-587 B.C., a Babylonian army began the siege of Jerusalem.

King Zedekiah and his people might have seen in this swift act of arms the contradiction of Hananiah's prophecy ; and at first sight it is surprising that they did not surrender the City. Their resolution to defend it proves the sincerity of the party whom Jeremiah himself had treated with such courtesy. And in truth, besides their religious beliefs this party of resistance had much that was substantial on which to rely. The walls of Jerusalem were strong and well-garrisoned. Nebuchadrezzar's general did not attempt to take them, but at first built, as Titus did centuries after, a rampart round the City. Egypt, too, was really ready to move to her relief ; and in order to show the sincerity of their faith in the help of Jahweh, the king and his council made the first actual step towards fulfilling the spirit of the Deuteronomic laws by engaging in the Temple to enfranchise all their Jewish slaves.¹ At first this atonement appeared to be successful. An Egyptian army advanced towards Jerusalem, and the Babylonians raised the siege. The confidence of Jeremiah's opponents revived. To the sincerely religious among them it may have appeared as if Jahweh had repeated the wonderful relief of 701. But the king and the people forgot their oath to release the slaves ; and on this ethical ground, if also from his saner estimate of the political situation, Jeremiah proclaimed that the Egyptians would withdraw and the Babylonians come back to besiege and to take the City. Either then, or previously, he replied to a deputation from the king, who inquired whether Jahweh had not been propitiated, that Jahweh's purpose was clear. They

¹ xxxiv. 8 ff.

must not deceive themselves with the thought that the Chaldeans would depart. Even if the expedition of Pharaoh were not futile, even if he had smitten the whole Chaldean army and only the wounded were left to it, *these would rise up every man in his tent and burn the City.*¹ That is to say, Jeremiah, now indifferent as to the military issue of the imminent conflict between Egypt and Babylon, was ethically convinced of the doom of Jerusalem. But the opposition to him remained. When, taking advantage of the withdrawal of the Chaldeans, he tried to go out to Anathoth to secure his patrimony, a captain of the guard arrested him on the charge of deserting to the enemy. In spite of his denial of this, *the princes*—how changed from those of Jehoiakim's reign!—*smote him and put him in a pit in the house of Jonathan the scribe.* Here he received a secret message from the distracted Zedekiah inquiring if there was any word from the Lord. He replied firmly that Zedekiah would be delivered into the hands of the king of Babylon, and then claimed that he ought to be set free. He was innocent, and if left in this dungeon, would die. Zedekiah answered with a compromise. He took Jeremiah out of the pit, but confined him *in the house of the guard, and gave him daily a loaf from the bakers' bazaar, till all the bread in the City was done.*²

The Babylonians returned, and the siege was held closer than before. Jeremiah appears to have got his release, but was a second time imprisoned,³ without doubt on the charge of *weakening the men of war* by persisting in his call to surrender.⁴ They cast him into a cistern in the house of Malchiah, from the mire of which he was drawn out by Ebed-Melech, the Ethiopian, and placed in the court of the guard, where the king again consulted him. It is

¹ xxxvii. 1-10.

² xxxvii. 11-21.

³ xxxiii. 1-13.

⁴ xxxviii. 4.

uncertain whether it was during his first or this second imprisonment that, confident as ever of the fall of the City, he pledged his hope for the future of the nation by purchasing from his uncle the fields in Anathoth.¹ But though Jerusalem should be burnt, he predicted its re-building,² and its restoration as a centre of worship.³ The form in which the latter prediction is put is very significant.

*For a day shall be when the watchers call
Upon Mount Ephraim—
“ Rise and let us go up to Sion,
To Jahweh our God.”*

That is to say, Jeremiah not only was confident of the resumption of worship in the Temple, but he conceived of the national worship as centralized there, in obedience to the Deuteronomic Law. This means, that in common with all his countrymen, he had accepted the great change in the ritual prescribed by that law and carried out by Josiah. But if that be so—and even Duhm admits the passage to be genuine—we have in it evidence that Duhm's theory of Jeremiah's indifference, or even hostility, to the Deuteronomic reforms, is quite impossible.

The end was not far off. The timid, those who in their despair felt that Jahweh had forsaken the City and those who had before deserted Him for the Babylonian gods, went over to the enemy.⁴ Famine ensued, and the pestilence.⁵ The enemy pressed, as every besieger before and after them did, upon the northern wall, where the ground was level, and their engines were not confronted as on other sides by high rocks. At last, on the ninth day of the fourth month

¹ xxxii. Stade assigns this to the first incarceration.

² xxxiii. 1-13.

³ xxxi. 2-6, which even Duhm admits to be an authentic oracle.

⁴ xxxviii. 19.

⁵ Id. 2.

of the eleventh year of Zedekiah, July 587-586, a breach was made. As the Chaldeans were thus about to enter on the north, the king and his guards fled by the gate in the south-east corner of the City, by the royal gardens, towards the Jordan. They had better have sought the deserts of Judah. They were pursued, captured, and taken to Riblah, where, after his sons were slain before him, the last king of Judah had his eyes put out and was carried to Babylon. The Chaldeans burned the Temple, the Palace, and many of the other houses. The walls were ruined. And the most of the population were carried away to Babylonia.

V. TOPOGRAPHY.

To complete this account of Jeremiah's Jerusalem, we have now to gather the topographical details, a few of which occur in the prophet's own oracles; but by far the most are given incidentally and in the plainest prose by Baruch, his biographer. The result is a picture of the City of a different character from that which we received from Isaiah. In his case the details come to us through a prophet's imagination of her ideal, or through the warmth of a heart that, while it was indignant with her careless crowds, still loved and pitied them. The like of this we cannot expect either from Jeremiah, who had no such love or imagination of Jerusalem, nor from Baruch, who was not a prophet but a scribe. But Baruch had the invaluable pedestrian sense of the ups and downs of his City's site, and the plain man's memory of the exact scenes of his hero's adventures. The result is a picture, grey indeed, but more accurate than any we have yet had, of the outlines and disposition of Jerusalem, as well as of her commoner buildings and more obscure receptacles. We may begin with the Temple, the centre and crown of the whole, cross its courts and come down through their gates to the Palace and its outhouses;

thence pass through the City to the walls and city gates, and so out upon the immediate surroundings.

Nothing is said of the architecture of the Temple; but it is referred to in the plural, *the Temple of Jahweh, the Temple of Jahweh are these*,¹ probably as including its courts and the separate buildings in them, for elsewhere these are implied as part of the Beth-Jahweh.² The usual term for visiting the Temple was to *go in* to it.³ The contents of the sanctuary are not mentioned, beyond the notice that Nebuchadrezzar carried away its furniture and vessels.⁴ Whether the Ark was still there or had disappeared we do not know.⁵ Round the Temple lay its court: *the court of the house of Jahweh*, where the prophet spoke because *all the people gathered there*⁶; *the upper court*, as Baruch calls it in distinction from the lower, *other* or *middle* court of the Palace, and *the great-court* which surrounded both.⁷ There were thus from Solomon's time to Jeremiah's *three* courts, of which only *one*, the *upper* or *inner*, was the Temple-court proper; and to it, as we see from the Books of Kings and from Baruch's narratives, the people were freely admitted both before and after the Deuteronomic reforms. The courts about the Second Temple were different. That next the sanctuary, corresponding to Solomon's *inner* court but apparently smaller, was called *the court of the priests*,⁸ and

¹ vii. 4; cf. Matthew xxiv. 1, 2.

² xxxv. 4, etc.

³ xxxvi. 5; cf. xxvi. 2.

⁴ xxviii. 3; lii. 18 (from the Book of Kings), etc.

⁵ The words in iii. 16, which imply that it had disappeared, occur in an obviously exilic passage: verses 14-18. Whether verse 16 be a quotation from Jeremah himself (so Erbt) it is impossible to say. There was a tradition after the Exile that Jeremiah hid the Ark: 4 Esdras x. 22; 2 Macc. ii. 5.

⁶ xix. 14, xxvi. 2: *the inner court* of 1 Kings vi. 36.

⁷ *Upper court*, xxxvi. 10; *other court*, 1 Kings vii. 8; *middle court*, 2 Kings xx. 4; *great court*, 1 Kings vii. 9, 12: Burney's emendation of this verse after the LXX. brings out all *three* courts.

⁸ The Chronicler (2 Chron. iv. 9) antedates this court, existing in his own time, to the time of Solomon, and calls an outer Temple-court the *New*

either from the beginning in accordance with Ezekiel's directions or from some later stage in its history the laity were excluded from it. Within the upper court were *chambers* or lodges for the priests and others, a few of whom are named: *the sons, or guild, of Hanan ben-Gedaliah, the man of God*, whose chamber was *beside the chamber of the officers*, and this *above* that of *Ma'aseyah ben-Shallum, a keeper of the threshold*¹; and *Gemariah ben-Shaphan, the scribe*, from the door or window of whose chamber Baruch read Jeremiah's roll *in the ears of all the people*.² That Jeremiah himself sometimes held one of those chambers seems probable from the number of times that the command came to him to *go down—to the king's house, to the house of the potter*.³ This upper court had several gates known as *the gates of the House of Jahweh*.⁴ One or two are named. On the south was *the new gate of Jahweh* or *of the House of Jahweh*,⁵ probably that which Jotham built or re-built.⁶ Where this stood is uncertain. The princes took their seats at it on coming up from the Palace,⁷ and so some place it on the south. But so public a gate could hardly have been next the Palace. It may have stood on the east. Or it may have been the same as the next one on the north of the upper court—the gate of Benjamin, called also *the upper*,⁷ perhaps to distinguish it from the corresponding gate of

court (xx. 5). Schlatter (*Zur Topogr. u. Gesch. Paläst.* 173) assigns this to Asa, and quotes 2 Kings xxi. 5 for the existence of two courts of the Temple in Manasseh's time. But if pre-exilic (which is doubtful), this verse regards the great-court as a Temple-court proper. And Schlatter's whole argument (from p. 167 onwards) for the pre-exilic Temple-courts is founded on the evidence of the Chronicler and the Rabbis, who speak only of post-exilic conditions.

¹ xxxv. 4.

² xxxvi. 10.

³ xxii. 1; xviii. 1.

⁴ vii. 2. LXX.

⁵ xxvi. 10; xxxvi. 10.

⁶ 2 Kings xv. 35.

⁷ Heb.: פְּתַח , {LXX. ἐν προθύροις.} xx. 2. πύλη οἴκου ἀποστρατημένου τοῦ ὑπερώου, the north gate of Ezek. viii. 3, ix. 2, and gate of altar viii. 5.

Benjamin on the City Wall. There stood *the stocks*—or perhaps low vault in which a prisoner had to sit bent—where Pashhur, the royal overseer of the Temple, confined Jeremiah. Another entry into this court is called *the third entry that is in the House of Jahweh*, but perhaps we should read *the entry of the Shalishim*, either a certain grade of officers, or the three divisions of the Temple and Palace guards.¹ The Septuagint, however, takes it as one of the houses in the court.

That the Palace, which was to the south of the Temple, lay upon a lower level than the latter is proved by the verbs which Baruch uses for passing between them. The princes of Judah, when they heard in the Palace the noise in the Temple court, *came up* from the king's house to the house of Jahweh.² Micaiah ben-Gemariah *went down* from the upper court to tell the princes of Baruch's reading of the roll.³ Like the upper court, the court of the Palace had its chambers or lodges for officials, of which one at least is mentioned, *the chamber of the king's scribe* or chancellor.⁴ Part of the Palace court was railed off as *the court of the ward*,⁵ in which prisoners were kept; and, as still in Oriental prisons, were allowed to transact business with their friends through the rail, and receive food from the outside.⁶ When it was felt that Jeremiah was not securely confined in such conditions, he was cast into a cistern in the court, described as that of *Malchiyah, son of the king*,

¹ xxxviii. 14. Shalish is the title of a certain officer in N. Israel (2 Kings vii. 2). On the divisions of the guard, see 2 Kings xi. 5-7. The LXX. of Jeremiah xxxviii. 14 gives, instead of this entry, the house of 'Aseleisel or Shealtiel: *εἰς οἰκίαν ἀσελεισηλ* (B), *ασαλιηλ* (Σ), *σαλαθηλ* (A).

² xxvi. 10.

³ xxxvi. 12; cf. xxii. 1: *go down to the house of the king of Judah*.

⁴ xxxvi. 12.

⁵ xxxii. 2: *בְּיַצֵּר הַמֶּלֶךְ*, which was in the king's house (thus, as in the case of the Temple, the name *the king's house* covered the court round it).

⁶ Id. 8, 12; xxxviii. 28; cf. xxxiii. 1; xxxix. 14 f.

or of *Hammelech*¹; and when more room was needed for political prisoners it was found in *the house of the cistern*, a vault with a cistern, under *the house of the scribe* or chancellor.² From this house the princes *went into the king, to the presence-chamber*.³ This was in *the winter-house*, where the king sat before a brasier⁴; the summer-house would be on an upper storey, to which lattices admitted the breeze.⁵ Within the Palace was also the house of the royal women⁶; and a *treasury* or *store-house* is mentioned, with vaults or pits beneath for cast clothes.⁷

The other public buildings on the Eastern or Temple Hill are not mentioned in the Book of Jeremiah.

Outside the Temple and Palace lay *the streets* or *bazaars of Jerusalem and her broad places*⁸—the narrow lanes for which the compact City⁹ has always been notorious, and the comparatively small open spaces within the gates. The various crafts gathered in their own bazaars. There were *the bakers' street*,¹⁰ *the house of the potter*¹¹; and doubtless the gold and silversmiths, the weavers,¹² the image-makers,¹³ the workers in wood, stone and metal,¹⁴ the locksmiths,¹⁵ and the wine-sellers¹⁶ had also each their own bazaar. The fish-sellers were by the Fish-gate.¹⁷ Again, no public buildings are mentioned; beyond the Palace and the Temple and the lodges in their courts, we hear only of the houses of the

¹ xxxviii. 6.

² xxxvii. 15.

³ xxxvi. 20; for הַחֲצֵרָה (*eis tēn aḥlāh*) *into the court*, where the king could hardly have sat in the winter, read הַחֲצֵרָה (after 1 Kings i. 15), generally the interior of a house (Deut. xxxii. 25), but especially the private room of the master (Jud. iii. 24, etc.).

⁴ Id. 22.

⁵ הַמְּיָרָה הַלְיָהּ, *upper chamber of cooling*, Judges iii. 20, 24. The upper storey is still called *'alīyah* in Arabic.

⁶ xxxviii. 22, etc.

⁷ Id. 11.

⁸ v. 1, etc., etc.

⁹ Ps. cxxii. 3.

¹⁰ xxxvii. 21.

¹¹ xviii. 2.

¹² x. 9; vi. 29.

¹³ x. 14.

¹⁴ All included under the common name שְׁרָרָה, xxiv. 1.

¹⁵ Ibid. כְּסָפָה; but the meaning is not certain.

¹⁶ xiii. 12.

¹⁷ Zephaniah i. 10: see *below*.

people¹; but among these were, as in the time of Amos, some *palaces*,² and *wide houses ceiled with cedar and painted with vermilion*.³ The roofs were flat, and the bazaars probably covered as in later days. Before the reforms of Josiah there was an altar in every street, and on the house-tops family services were performed to Baal and the host of heaven.⁴ Neither the size of the City nor its divisions are given; the name *City of David* is not mentioned. But from Zephaniah⁵ we learn that Jerusalem comprised the *Mishneh* or *Second-town* and the *Maktesh* or *Mortar*, perhaps the hollow between the western and eastern hills where the Phœnician merchants and money dealers had their quarters.⁶

We hear, of course, of the City's walls and gates.⁷ Of the latter four at least are named: the gate *Harsith* (Potsherds?) on the valley of Hinnom⁸; *the gate between the two walls by the king's garden*,⁹ in the extreme south-east by Siloam; *the middle gate*,¹⁰ probably on the north wall, and *the city gate of Benjamin*,¹¹ on the north-east; and from Zephaniah, the *Fish-gate*. In exilic additions to the Book we find also the *Corner-gate* and *Horse-gate*,¹² and the *Gate of the Children of the People* (?)¹³ The two former occur in a passage which defines the boundaries of the City, beginning with the north-east corner *from the tower Hananeel to the gate of the corner*, on the north-west, *the measuring line shall go out to the hill Gareb* (which is a place-name or designation of a field in

¹ xxxix. 8; lii. 13 (= 2 Kings xxv. 9).

² ix. 21.

³ xxii. 14.

⁴ xxxii. 29, etc.

⁵ i. 10, 11.

⁶ *Mishneh*: 2 Kings xxii. 14, 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 22, which state that the prophetess Huldah lived there. Cf. Nehemiah iii. 9, 12, xi. 9 *Maktesh*: Zeph. i. 11.

⁷ xvii. 1-10, 19.

⁸ xix. 2.

⁹ xxxix. 4.

¹⁰ xxxix. 3.

¹¹ xxxvii. 13.

¹² xxxi. 38, 40.

¹³ xvii. 19: *by which the kings of Judah go in and out.*

other Semitic languages),¹ presumably at the south-west corner, *and it shall turn round towards Goah*; or, as the Syriac gives it, Gabatha or Gibeah,² and . . .³ *and all the fields to the torrent of Kidron to the angle of the Horse-gate eastward.*

In the topography of the Book of Jeremiah nothing is more distinctive than its treatment of the surroundings of Jerusalem. We hear, by name or feature, of places further afield: of Anathoth, Ramah, Bethhaccerem, Tekoa, Mizpah, the trench which King Asa made against Baasha of Israel, the great waters that are in Gibeon, and Geruth, or Gidroth, Chimham, near Bethlehem. But of the immediate suburbs of the City, their names or features, almost none are given. We hear nothing of Nob, the Mount of Olives, or the Plain of Rephaim; nothing of Giḥon, 'En-Rogel, the conduits or the highways; nothing of the near sky-lines or the woods, or (till the very end) of the King's Garden. Jeremiah and his biographers behold Jerusalem only as the City of Doom—doomed by the sins which burst into their wildest orgies beneath her walls, doomed to the assaults which must presently fill her environs. And, therefore, these environs, so striking in their features and so brilliant in their memories, are described only as the haunts of idolatry, the scenes of siege, the site of graves. It is as if to the prophet's eye Jerusalem had no longer any suburbs save guilt and war and death.

Thus the oracles upon the Scythian and Babylonian invasions predict in their vivid way the defenceless country-

¹ Sabean סבב, a place-name. In Arabic different forms of the root mean "rough," "scaly," "rusty"; a measure of corn or size of field on which it can be sown, and cold north wind. Aram, an earthen vessel, measure of corn and size of field which can be sown with it, leprosy, and northward. Assyr. leprous.

² LXX. : ἐξ ἐκλεκτῶν λιθῶν.

³ *All the valley of the corpses and the ashes of the fat* omitted by LXX., and perhaps a gloss.

folk streaming for refuge to Sion,¹ the approach of the foe always from the north, the setting of his first posts,² his felling of the trees and casting of ramps against the walls,³ the corpses scattered over the fields,⁴ and the final acres of graves.⁵ But for all we are told of the shape or disposition of the stage on which these scenes are to be enacted, it might be a level plain, without feature, name or memory. And the only waft of its natural atmosphere that we feel is the sirocco blowing in from the bare heights of the desert, *a hot wind neither to fan nor to cleanse, towards the daughter of my people.*⁶

The single variation to these prospects of suburban war is introduced in connexion with the national sin. The prophet's eye, to which the whole land was defiled, saw the pollution concentrated upon the valleys and slopes about the Holy City. The curse of Manasseh was upon them. The worst rites of the idolatries which that king had introduced or revived could not be performed within the walls of the capital. The adoration of the host of heaven might be offered from every housetop and upon the Temple-courts themselves. But the sacrifice of children, prompted by a more malignant superstition, had to be performed, in accordance with the conscience of the ancient world, outside the walls, and in one of the ravines which entrench them. Except the Kidron this is the only suburb which the oracles or narratives of Jeremiah mention: the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom.

Both the name and the position of this sinister valley have been the subjects of much discussion. Of the name there are various forms: *Gê-ben-Hinnom*, *Ravine*, or *Gorge, of the Son of Hinnom*,⁷ *Gê-bne-Hinnom*, *Gorge of the Sons of*

¹ iv. 6.² iv. 16, vi. 3.³ vi. 6 ff.⁴ ix. 22.⁵ vii. 32.⁶ iv. 11.⁷ Heb. text of Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, xxxiii. 6; Jer. xix. 2; and the Heb. and Greek of Jer. vii. 31, 32, xix. 6, xxxii. 35.

Hinnom,¹ Gê-Hinnom²; and Ha-Gai or *The Gorge*.³ The last two of these occur only in late passages and are doubtless abbreviations of the first, which from its frequency is to be preferred to the second.⁴ Whether Ben-Hinnom was the name of a man or of a deity it is impossible to say. The reading is too often confirmed in both the Hebrew and the Greek of the Old Testament⁵ to leave room for emendation (Canon Cheyne has on religious grounds proposed Na'aman),⁶ and the attempts to translate it as *wailing*, in reference to the cries of the sacrificed children, are fanciful and have received little support. It must be admitted that no name corresponding to Hinnom, either human or divine, has been found in Hebrew or any other Semitic language; and it is not impossible, therefore, that the term was originally geographical or botanical. It occurs only from the time of Ahaz (? or Manasseh⁷) to that of the Chronicler. In the Targums it appears not in a geographical but in a theological sense⁸; and in the same sense the gorge is described without being named in the Apocalyptic literature.⁹ The Books of Maccabees and Josephus do not give the name, nor is it employed geographically in the Talmud, except perhaps to designate a valley of hot springs east of Jordan.¹⁰ Apparently it had ceased to be used of the gorge at Jerusalem after 300 B.C.

¹ Kethibh of 2 Kings xxiii. 10 (but the Keri and Gk. have *son*), and the Gk. Cod. B of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6 and Jer. xix. 2.

² Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 6 (once each in Heb., twice in Gk.) and Neh. xi. 30 (omitted in Gk.).

³ 2 Chron. xxvi. 9, Neh. ii. 13, 15, iii. 13; perhaps also Jer. ii. 23.

⁴ The plural Bne may have risen from assonance with the preceding Gê.

⁵ Heb. always גֵּהֶנְנוֹם; Gk. *Ennom* (most frequently), *Ovnom*, *Ovnom*, and in Josh. xviii. 16 *Γαιεννα* (B) and *Γαι Οννομ* (A).

⁶ *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. "Hinnom, Valley of."

⁷ See below. It has been proposed as an emendation to the *Valley of Vision* in Isa. xxii. 1, 5.

⁸ On Psalm cxl. 11: גֵּהֶנְנוֹם.

⁹ R. H. Charles, *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, art. "Gehenna."

¹⁰ Neubauer, *Geog. du Talmud*, 36 f.

The Gorge of Hinnom has been placed by different authorities in each of the three valleys of Jerusalem: the eastern Kidron or Wady en-Nâr, the central Tyropoeon, el-Wâd, and the southern (and western) Wady er-Rabâbi; while some have sought to unite these views, so far as Topheth is concerned, by placing the latter on the open junction of the three valleys below Siloam.

1. In the *Onomasticon* Eusebius and Jerome place Γαιεννοῦμ or Gehennom under the eastern wall of Jerusalem; the Moslem geographers Muḳaddasi and Nâsir-i-Khusrau call the Kidron-valley Wâdy Jahannum; the Jewish commentator Kimchi¹ identifies the valleys of Jehoshaphat and Hinnom; and on Fuller's Map in his *Pisgah Sight of Palestine* the "Vallis Ben-Hinnom" runs between the City and the Mount of Olives. Dean Stanley and Sir Charles Warren have revived this identification.² But their argument for it is defective in all its premises. The identification does not "follow from Jeremiah xix. 11." The gate Ḥarsith, which opened on Hinnom, does not mean East-gate. The identity of 'En-rogel with the Virgin's Fountain, on which Sir Charles Warren depends, is contradicted by the narrative of Solomon's coronation.³ And the Mohammedan tradition, which he quotes, is not only contradicted by another, for Idrisi places Jahannum in the W. er-Rabâbi⁴; but the origin of it, as well as of the statement in Eusebius, may be easily accounted for—and in this way. When the Gê-ben-Hinnom, as a place-name, had disappeared from the surroundings of Jerusalem, the theological Gehinnom as a state of torment for apostate Jews could not remain in the air, but demanded a local habita-

¹ On Isa. lxvi. 24.

² Stanley, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, xiv.; Warren on "Hinnom" in *Hastings' Bible Dict.*

³ *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1903, p. 225.

⁴ Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i. 403; this, however, is not quite certain.

tion ; and this was found for it, if one can judge from Isaiah lxvi. 24, somewhere near the Temple and in all probability in the valley of the Kidron.¹ As we see from the story of Josiah's reforms, the bed of the Kidron was already a place for refuse and regarded as unclean. The offal of the Temple, according to the Old Testament and the Talmud,² was cast into it ; and probably in part consumed by fire. In any case, we may see how the theological Gehinnom came to be located here ; the more so, that according to the belief about it, the sufferings of its victims were to take place in sight of the righteous, of whose eternal habitations the Temple-courts were the natural symbol. But this location of the theological Gehinnom in the Kidron Valley (from which probably arose the modern name, Wady en-Nâr), is no argument for placing there the actual Gê-ben-Hinnom. On the contrary, such a geographical identification is excluded by these two data of the Old Testament : that the Kidron is never called Gai but Nahal, and that the gate which Nehemiah calls the Gate of the Gai lay not on the east of the City over Kidron, but on the west over either the Tyropoeon or the W. er-Rabâbi.

2. The Gê-ben-Hinnom has been identified by the Rev. W. F. Birch, Professor Robertson Smith and Professor Sayce with the Tyropoeon. This is not unsuitable to the place assigned to the Gai in the record of the boundary between Benjamin and Judah,³ nor to the data provided by Nehemiah.⁴ But it is only possible if the Tyropoeon lay outside the City at the time of Manasseh, for human sacrifices never

¹ So Kimchi on this passage.

² Jer. xxxi. 40: *Jerus.* "Nazir," 57. 4; *Babyl.* "Yoma," 58. 2. Buhl's identification (p. 94) of the 'emek' of Jer. xxxi. 40 with the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom is on the ground of the name impossible. The 'emek' is the more open space of the Kidron-valley.

³ Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16.

⁴ Which Robertson Smith, indeed, thinks a proof of the identification.

took place within the walls of a town. But, as we have seen,¹ Siloam in the lower Tyropoeon was within the City by the time of Hezekiah ; and its reservoir, to which that monarch brought the waters of Gihon by a conduit beneath Ophel, could have been of no use to the citizens in time of siege unless they also held the Western hill. Under Manasseh, therefore, the Tyropoeon was well within the City and could not have been the scene of the sacrifice of children.

3. There remains the third of the valleys, the Wady er-Rabābi. This suits the direction assigned to the Gê-ben-Hinnom on the border between Benjamin and Judah ; and under the later monarchy, as at all other times, it lay outside the City walls. By far the greatest number of modern authorities accept it as the Gai.² Sir Charles Wilson has suggested that the name Hinnom may have extended to the flat ground where all three valleys meet.³ Here in fact it was placed by Jerome in his Commentary on Jeremiah⁴ : among the gardens watered from Siloam, a place " amoenus atque nemorosus, hodieque hortorum delicias præbet." And mediæval writers argued that Topheth and Hinnom both meant pleasure, and supported the argument by an alleged antithesis between these names and the *Valley of Slaughter* in Jeremiah vii. 32.⁵ Hence Milton's " pleasant valley of Hinnom." But the junction of the three valleys is practically part of the Nahal Kidron and too open to be designated a Gai. The designation fully suits the W. er-Rabābi a little way up from its mouth, where the rocks are high and the passage narrow. Certainly the scenery is there more consonant to the gloomy superstition and its savage rites than are the gardens and groves watered from Siloam.

¹ EXPOSITOR, July, 1905.

² Quaresmius, Barclay, Robinson, Wilson, Socin, Buhl, Benzinger, etc.

³ Smith's *Dict. of the Bible* (sec. ed.), 1373.

⁴ On vii. 31 f.

⁵ Quaresmius, lib. iv. cap. xviii.

On the ridge of the south lies the traditional Aceldama, the field of blood, and the rock around is honeycombed with groves. Melander (*Z.D.P.V.* xvii. 25 ff.) argues that this traditional Aceldama was the site of Topheth.

If one may judge from Phoenician analogies—and the rites were borrowed from Phoenicia—a great fire pit, a development of the primitive hearth, was dug on the floor of the gorge; and upon a pile of fuel or more elaborate structure, called the Topheth or more correctly Tephath,¹ the victim after being slain was laid, a whole burnt offering. The deity, who was supposed to demand so cruel an oblation, is named by the Hebrew text Molech,² but there are grounds for believing that this was a divine title, Melech,³ or King, rather than a name; and that the awful Despot who demanded such a propitiation was regarded by the Jews as none other than their own God. The terms in which the prophets of the seventh century remonstrate against the practice show that the people imagined they had Jahweh's command for it.⁴ They could quote the letter of an ancient law to that effect,⁵ and they had strong motives to so extreme a propitiation in that sense of Jahweh's wrath, which one national disaster after another stirred up within them.⁶ The practice is said to have been begun by Ahaz in the despair to which he was reduced by Aram and Israel,⁷

¹ The Hebrew vocalization Topheth is apparently modelled upon Bosheth=shame, and the vowels also give it the same sound as the word for a thing *spat at* or *abhorred*. The Greek gives Ταφθη. The word is probably borrowed from the Aramaic, in which נִפְתָּה means *fireplace*. See Rob. Smith, *Rel. of the Sem.* (sec. ed.), 377.

² Jer. xxxii. 35; 2 Kings xxiii. 10.

³ Changed to Molech by the vowels of Bosheth as in the case of Topheth.

⁴ "Micah" vi. 6 f.; Jer. vii. 31; Ezekiel xx. 18 ff.

⁵ Exod. xiii. 12, quoted by Ezekiel, loc. cit.

⁶ The best discussion of this subject is the rich and careful argument by G. F. Moore, *Enc. Bibl.* art. "Molech."

⁷ Moore indeed argues that the reference to Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 4) cannot be correct, for the prophets of the eighth century do not condemn the sacrifice of children as those of the seventh century do. But it is difficult to

and it was revived by Manasseh, and spread among his subjects. The horror which it excited is vividly expressed in the remonstrances of Jeremiah. The place was accursed. God would slay His people upon it till it *should no more be called the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom but the Gorge of Slaughter*,¹ and it should be covered with graves : a Polyandron, as the Greek Version calls it, a place populous with the dead. This prediction was fulfilled not there alone, but all round the encircling valleys of Jerusalem, which are choked with her debris and the dust of her slain. The name itself, obliterated from the spot,² was translated to a still more awful use, and became, as Gehinnom, Geenna, Gehenna and Jahannum, the Hell alike of the Jewish, the Christian and the Moslem theologies. In the case of the Jews this Hell, as we have seen, was located in the Kidron valley below the Temple.

So Jeremiah saw Jerusalem awaiting her doom—an apostate City, beleaguered by her sins, her relentless foes, and the graves of her perpetually slaughtered people.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

perceive why the historian's attribution of the practice to Ahaz should be less correct than that to Manasseh, which Moore accepts. And, as we have seen (EXPOSITOR, May, 1905, p. 384 f.), the fact that Isaiah, when confronting Ahaz, took with him his own son dedicated by the symbolic name to hope, appears to have been the prophet's rebuke to the king for dedicating his son to despair.

¹ Jer. vii. 32.

² See above.

*THE SON OF MAN AS THE LIGHT OF THE
WORLD.*

TOWARDS the close of that memorable scene described in St. John's Gospel (ch. xii. 20-36), when certain Greeks were brought to our Lord in the Temple courts by St. Philip and St. Andrew to be introduced to Him, the multitude asked : " Who is this Son of man ? " Both the circumstances out of which the question arose, the question itself, and the answer given to it are profoundly interesting, and, as the last words of the public ministry of Jesus as narrated by St. John, have special significance. It is in the hope of possibly throwing further light on the meaning of our Lord's answer to the question that this paper is written.

We are not told that this discourse of Jesus was especially directed to the Greeks who had come to hear Him. But it is impossible not to think of them as among the crowd of eager listeners ; though, as far as it appears, they were silent listeners ; for the question itself was put by men who had a theory about the Messiah (*v.* 34), and therefore Jews. There are, however, indications in our Lord's words which seem to show that they were intended especially for those Greeks who stood there as representatives of the Gentile world thus brought into contact with Him. While other discourses of Jesus are not to be understood without reference to the history or customs or institutions of the Jews,¹ the teaching of this discourse is based on facts as wide as human nature itself. It is a revelation, not so much about the Jewish Messiah, as about the Son of man, who is glorified through sacrifice,—a title of which more will be said

¹ See, for instance, the historical and local allusions in conversation with Nicodemus (ch. iii. 1-15) ; with the woman of Samaria (ch. iv. 5-42) ; in the discourse at Capernaum (ch. vi. 25-66) ; and in the parable of the Good Shepherd (ch. x. 1-18).

below. Here it is sufficient to note that whatever may be the origin or precise meaning of the title, it is one which can be translated into the thought and language of other nationalities more easily and intelligibly than any other Messianic name. It implies at least in Him who assumes the name a presentation of complete and perfect manhood, and of man created in the image of God. This was, to begin with, a thought not impossible to be brought home to a Greek intellect. And the sublime doctrine of sacrifice, which follows, is universal in its application. Moreover it is illustrated by a parable which would be quickly apprehended by the Greek. For the mysteries of Demêtêr, which furnished him with the deepest and most beautiful of his religious conceptions, were much concerned with the death and resurrection of the grain of wheat. The thought itself—the sacrifice of the lower life in order to gain the higher—was indeed opposed to the ideal of Greek civilization, in which the absolute perfection of the human form and the human intellect was the foremost aim. Still, when Christ applied to His own experience the glory and attraction of sacrifice, as the summit of human excellence, exhibited in the Son of man, he said words which all history has proved to be profoundly true, “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself.” They are profoundly true words, for the Cross of Christ is the secret of the attraction of Christianity.

It is easy to see that the teachings and example of sacrifice came naturally from One who claimed to be “the Son of man”; because it is teaching that has touched a chord in all humanity. It has been irresistibly and most unexpectedly convincing in the experience of mankind, after the Christian revelation, for reasons which lie deep in human nature.

As “the multitude” (of Jews) listened to these words

of Jesus, they were silently in their own minds trying to reconcile them with their [preconceived idea of the Messiah. They seem to have experienced no difficulty in interpreting the expression "be lifted up" of death, though the Evangelist finds it necessary to explain that expression to his readers by one of those "notes" which are characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. (Sec *v.* 33: "This he said signifying by what manner of death he should die.")

The difficulty with the Jews was how to reconcile this prediction of death with a claim to be the Messiah. The form of question also implies an identification in their minds of the Son of man with the Christ. "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up?" More than this, the form of question also implies the identification of the Christ, and consequently of the Son of man with Jesus. For the expression in the immediate context to which reference seems to be made is not, "The Son of man must be lifted up," but "If I be lifted up from the earth." It is true that at an earlier part of the discourse Jesus had spoken of the Son of man. But then His words were, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified" (*v.* 23). And although the glory of the Son of man did in fact come through His death upon the cross, that is not an interpretation which would naturally have presented itself to the Jews. We must therefore conclude that when Jesus spoke of Himself as being "lifted up," the Jews thought of Him as "the Son of man" lifted up on the cross to die. And indeed this precise expression occurs earlier in the ministry (ch. *iii.* 14). And our Lord's mysterious converse with Nicodemus might well have been reported in Jerusalem to many disciples of Jesus, or inquirers about His doctrine.

The question which was asked here, partly perhaps with

a touch of scorn, "Who is this Son of man?" is one of intense interest, and not even to this day completely probed and answered. It is at least certain that Jesus designated Himself by this name, and it is probable that it was one by which He was widely known in Galilee. It is a name that at once concealed and explained the Messiahship. When Jesus inquired of St. Peter, "Who do men say that I the Son of man am?" He received an answer that implied wonder and expectation, and a possible realization of high hopes, but not the true answer, which it was reserved for St. Peter alone to give. That answer was accepted as the revelation "not of flesh and blood, but of the Father in heaven" (St. Matt. xvi. 16, 17). And it is to be noted that this first confession of Jesus, as the Christ, is made under His own designation of Himself as the Son of man. St. Peter's answer is in effect that the Son of man is "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

On the occasion we are considering Jesus makes no direct answer to the question addressed to Him. On the other hand, is it necessary to regard our Lord's words as throwing no light whatever on the significance of the title by which He had condescended to be known? It is true that the commentators seem to agree in an interpretation which dissociates the words from any but an indirect connexion with the question asked. Bengel, for instance, notes: "Jesus non respondit interpellationi eorum sed subiecit ea quae maxime sunt necessaria." Alford to the same effect: "He does not answer them, but enjoins them to make use of the time of His presence yet left them." Meyer (Eng. Trans.): "Jesus does not enter upon the question raised, but directs the questioners to that one point which concerns them, with the intensity and seriousness of one who is on the point of taking His departure." Godet: "Jésus au lieu de répondre à la question qui lui est faite

adresse aux Juifs une dernière sommation." Westcott has : "*Jesus therefore said . . .* meeting their difficulties by charging them to use the opportunities which they still had for fuller knowledge. . . . The words are not described as an answer (*v.* 30), but as an independent utterance."

While admitting the weight of this consensus, and the truth of the interpretation in one direction, we still venture to think that the words implicitly convey an answer which would lead thoughtful minds to trace in these words an intention to identify Christ the Son of man with Christ the Light of the world. If this could be proved, it would be an additional example of this Evangelist's method, by which a truth once stated is never lost sight of. In the forefront of his revelation of the Christ St. John sets Him forth as the Light of the world ; and the closing words of the ministry of Christ are cited to show that the life of the Son of man which was sacrificed was indeed the "light of men." (See ch. i. 4, 9.)

Again, if we could find in these words our Lord's answer to the question, "Who is this Son of man?" the value of them would be immeasurably enhanced, as conveying an illustration by Christ Himself of the significance of the name.

That the words should suggest, rather than definitely explain, is characteristic of our Lord's way of answering questions. Not a few instances may be cited in which our Lord makes His reply a means or occasion, as here, of giving a needed warning or counsel to His hearers. When, for instance, one said unto Him, "Lord, are they few that be saved?" our Lord's reply, "Strive to enter in by the narrow door" (St. Luke xii. 23, 24), is suggestive rather than direct and definite. Again, when the disciples ask, "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" Jesus suggests, without precisely stating, the true nature of the Kingdom : "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost

is come upon you ” ; and then gives the royal injunction : “ Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth ” (Acts i. 6-8). And, like these last words, the very first recorded words of Jesus furnish another example of this characteristic : “ How is it that ye sought me ? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business ? ” Possibly the first revelation to Mary of her Son’s consciousness of His Divine nature, not explicitly stated, but wonderfully suggested.

The passage before us is inspired by the same suggestiveness, and in the same way carries with it the veiled answer. Jesus leads His disciples on to think of the Son of man as the Light of the world. And further consideration will show in how many points the one Messianic title illustrates the other.

The title of “ The Son of man ” and its use by our Lord of Himself, have been traced by some writers to Daniel vii. 13 ; where, however, the expression is not “ the Son of man,” but “ One like unto a son of man ” ; and by others, on surer grounds, to Psalm viii. 4-6. (Comp. Heb. ii. 7.) But, as Bishop Westcott observes (additional note on St. John i. 51-7), “ The title as we find it in the Gospels, *the Son of man*, absolutely was a new one.” And it is not to be supposed that our Lord would have appropriated to Himself a title which in popular estimation directly pointed to Him as the Messiah.

But in St. Matthew xvi. 17 He sanctions the interpretation of this title as the Christ, the Son of the living God ; and here He implicitly identifies it with Himself as the Light of the world. The first was in a special sense a revelation to the Jew, the second in the fulness of its meaning a revelation to the Gentile. Jesus was to be “ a light to lighten the Gentiles,” as well as to be “ the glory of His people Israel.”

There are at least three aspects in which the two Messianic titles, the Son of man and the Light of the world, mutually illustrate one another: (1) In regard to the Incarnation; (2) As a revelation of truth; (3) In respect of guidance and example.

1. The universality of the Incarnation, which is the gift of the Son of man, is illustrated by the universality and all-pervadingness of light. Bishop Westcott has pointed out¹ that in all the passages where the title "Son of man" occurs the Incarnation is an essential part of the teaching which they convey. It is probable that in St. John ix. 35 the true reading is "Son of man," and not "Son of God." In that passage the title has a special significance, closely akin to that which it bears in the message to the Greeks, which we are now considering. Jesus is there revealing Himself to the man, whom He had cured of blindness, and who by his brave adherence to the logic of facts had incurred the wrath and condemnation of the Jewish authorities. He was the first disciple of Christ who had suffered excommunication, and was therefore in a sense the first member of a purely Christian Church. Now, however little this convert, or the Greeks in the temple afterwards, apprehended the significance of the name of the "Son of man," it would at least convey the thought of salvation coming from One who had something essentially in common with all mankind. The name itself suggested a movement, which passed beyond the limits of Judaism. Belief in the Son of man is, says Bishop Westcott, "the elementary form of the confession of the Incarnation on which the Universal Church rests." Further Christian teaching and experience showed that in a true and deep sense the "Son of man" gathered within Himself all humanity. And by virtue of

¹ Additional note on St. John ix. 35.

God in Him taking flesh, all mankind had a potential share in the Divine nature.

Now this great thought of the new birth which is the effect of the Incarnation, itself the gift of the Son of man, is never more vividly expressed than by the symbol of "the true Light, which lighteth every man coming into the world" (St. John i. 9).

Whichever of the two possible grammatical constructions be given to that passage, the sense of universality remains, nothing can destroy the significance of "every man." Either the true Light, coming as a continuous, uninterrupted stream, illuminates every child of man not only at his birth but throughout his life, as the sunlight falls continuously on leaf and flower; or else, the true light lightens every man as he comes into existence. As in nature light is the universal source of vegetative life, so the true light, the incarnate Son of God, is the Universal Cause of the new birth to men.

2. Again, as light reveals the truth of things, the Son of man reveals the truth of humanity. As the Son of God is the express image of God, one with Him in nature and essence, so the "Son of man" is the express image and type of perfect manhood—the perfection into which those who have put on the new man are growing (Col. iii. 10). Jesus Christ came to show what human nature is capable of at its best and holiest. This is the meaning of "truth as it is in Jesus." Truth in all its variety of meaning found its ideal expression in Him. In this sense the Son of man is the light of the world. For light is essentially a revealer of truth. "Everything that is made manifest is light" (Eph. v. 13).

3. But light not only illuminates; it also guides. And the Son of man is not only the mirror of the perfection of human nature, He also guides His people in the way of

truth. He sets before us an ideal, a possibility of perfectness, which it is our duty not only to admire but to imitate and realize. This ideal of human nature and perfectness of manhood Jesus, in the passage we are considering, calls the light. The change made in R.V. in *v.* 35 is worthy of note—"Jesus *therefore* said unto them," not as in A.V., "Then Jesus said unto them." Therefore, i.e. in answer to their question, and in order to explain the meaning of "the Son of man." The explanation is conveyed in the words that follow. "Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not; and he that walketh in the darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." The revelation, then, is of the Son of man, who is Christ our example (1 Peter ii. 21), as the Light that guides—the thought which Newman has so beautifully expressed in the familiar hymn :

Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
 Lead Thou me on;
 The night is dark, and I am far from home;
 Lead Thou me on.

ARTHUR CARR.

THE AMORITE CALENDAR.

It is well known that in early Babylonian times month names are found to have been in use which rarely appear later. The names of the months which are most generally known are those of the native "Babylonian" Calendar, as we may call it here for distinctness. These are in order—Nisânu, Aiâru, Simânu, Du'ûzu, Âbu, Ulûlu, Tišrîtu, Araḥsamna, Kislîmu, Ṭebêtu, Šabâtu and Addaru. It is agreed that the Hebrews borrowed these names in the forms Nisân, Iyyâr, Sîwân, Tammûz, Âb, Elûl, Tišrî, Marhešwân, Kislew, Ṭebêt, Šebât, and Adâr. The correspondence is very close indeed, and presents some interesting points, such as the

consistent replacement of the *m* by *waw*, the preservation of the same consonants and the length of the vowels. The variations seen in Tammûz for Du'ûzi, Marhešwân for Arahšamna, and the loss of the *t* in Tišrî deserve notice. We may return to them.

This was not, however, the only calendar in use. The "Babylonian" month names given above are known to be the equivalents of the Sumerian names which may be read, in the same order, as BAR-ZAG-GAR, GUD-SI-DI, MUR-GU-A, ŠŪ-KUL-A, NE-NE-GAR, KIN-(AN)NINNI, DUL-AZAG, GIŠ-APIN-GAB-A, KAN-KAN-UD-DU, AB-UD-DU, AŠ-A, ŠE-KIN-KUD. This we will call the "Sumerian" Calendar. The abbreviations of these names, BAR, GUD, MURGU, ŠŪ, NE, KIN, DUL, APIN, KAN, AB, AŠ, ŠE, were used in later times as ideograms for the months; so that, for example, *arĥu DUL* is to be read *arĥu Tišrîtu*. There is no connexion between the "Sumerian" and "Babylonian" names for the same month, beyond a general similarity of meaning in some cases. As a whole, the Babylonian names are not Semitic translations of the Sumerian names.

The "Sumerian" Calendar given above was in use before and down to the close of the third millennium B.C. In still earlier times other Sumerian names for months have been found. Dr. H. Radau, in his *Early Babylonian History*, pp. 287-307, gives a discussion of many of these names, which we will distinguish as "Early Sumerian." In the business documents of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon, we find in use some of these "Early Sumerian" month names, usually simply the "Sumerian" names, some of the "Babylonian" names, together with a fourth set of Semitic names. It is very interesting to find at such an early date spellings like *A-ia-ri*, *A-ia-ri-im*, *A-ia-ru-um*, *A-ia-rum* for Aiâru, or *E-lu-li* and *E-lu-lu* for Ulûlu. The latter case is

interesting because the Hebrews borrowed that form, not the later Ulûlu.

It is the fourth set with which this paper is chiefly concerned. Mr. L. W. King, in note 3 p. xxxv. of his *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, vol. iii., has given a list of these month names, which he reads as Dûr-abi (or aga), Dûr-Rammânu, Elunu, H̄umtu, Kinunu, Nabru, Sibutu, Rabutu and Tirum, with references to the inscriptions in which they occur. To this list I would add now Mamitu and perhaps Šubutu; possibly Tirinu, if this be not the same as Tirum. It is clear that these are not the same as either the "Babylonian" or "Sumerian" names given above. They form part of a different calendar. Whose calendar was this? It has long been recognized by scholars that the names of the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, as well as the names of many of their subjects appearing in contemporary business documents, are neither Babylonian nor Sumerian. Comparisons of these names with Canaanite, Hebrew, or Arabic personal names have led different writers to call the bearers of these names Amorite, Arabic, Canaanite or West Semitic. Dr. H. Ranke, in his *Early Babylonian Personal Names* (Philadelphia, 1905), p. 33, however, calls attention to the fact "that the native Babylonians called these foreign cousins, who had become residents in their country, by the name of *mârê Amurru*," or, as we may say, "Amorites." In using this term, we need not imply that these people were the same in race as the Amorites mentioned in the Holy Scriptures; nor that they were the same as the Amurri of the later Assyrian inscriptions and located by them in Canaan. If the name Amurru designates the same people everywhere, the questions remain to be solved whether these Amorites in Babylonia came from the land of Amurru in Canaan, or whether the Canaanite Amorites came from Babylonia, having first

settled there; or whether both sets of Amorites came separately from some one common home, say in South Arabia. If they came from Canaan, the name Canaanite for the dynasty is partly justified; if from Arabia, we may call it Arabic; the use of the name Amorite need not assume either answer. The name West Semitic is based on linguistic considerations, but when applied to these people seems to imply that they came into Babylonia from the West, which has still to be proved. We shall, therefore, call them Amorites, bearing in mind that their names do show marked likenesses to those of the Semites settled later in Syria, Canaan, Phoenicia, and South Arabia.

To return to the calendar. We have used "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" to denote completely different sets of month names. We have decided to call a third race settled in Babylonia, whose names appear in the same documents with these fresh month names, by the name "Amorite." It is, therefore, tempting to call this the "Amorite Calendar." It can hardly be ascribed to another unknown, unsuspected, unnamed folk.

We may now proceed to inquire whether we can discover the relations between these "Amorite" month names and the "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" months. As Mr. King has already pointed out in his note, referred to above, one document gives Rabûtim on the inner tablet, while the outer case gives the Sumerian *BAR-ZAG-GAR*, which we know to be the Babylonian Nisânu.

There are a number of contracts of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon which deal with the hire of labourers, or the renting of houses, for fixed terms, usually by the year. Some of these state the month with which the term of service or lease of the house commenced, and the month in which it ended, as well as the full duration of the period. They do this in a way which fixes the order of

the months. It is clear that if a man was hired for a year, beginning, say, with January, he would leave his service at the end of December ; or, if he hired a house for a year, and entered it on the first of July, he would leave it on the last of June. Now the formula used in these contracts is very explicit. It runs like this : *ina arhi X irub, arha Y igammarma uši*, that is, " he entered (the house or service) in the month of X, he shall complete the month of Y and go out (leave the house or service)." The few variants of this formula which occur consist in the presence or absence of the mimmation, a certain looseness in the use of the cases, and some variations in the verbs. But the conclusion is inevitable, the month Y must have preceded the month X. When, however, by " in the month " was meant some time different from " at the beginning of the month " ; for example, if the house was entered on the fourth of X, the tenant must leave on the third of X next year, twelve months later ; then we may have X and Y the same month.

We may first take an example, where we know both X and Y, to prove that these ancient people reckoned exactly as we do. On the certainty of this depends our whole argument. Here is one of several. A contract, V.A. Th. 766, published by Dr. Meissner in his *Beiträge zum Altbabylonischen Privatrecht* (M.A.P.), No. 70, says of a tenant of a house, *arhi Abu ûm I(KAM) irûb, arha Du'ûzu igammarma uzzi*, " he entered in the month of Âbu, on the first day, he shall complete the month of Du'ûzu and leave." Then Du'ûzu must have preceded Âbu, as we know it did, otherwise.

In a slightly different case, Bu. 91-5-9, 1081, published in the British Museum *Corpus* of inscriptions, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, etc., volume vi. [C.T. vi.], p. 41, we read *arhi Elûli ûm I(KAM) irûb, arha KIN-(AN)-NINNI igammilma lizi*, " he entered on the first of Elûlu,

he shall complete the month Ulûlu (Sumerian *KIN-AN-NINI*) and he may leave." Here it would seem that the term of service was thirteen months, though the labourer was hired for one year, as the document expressly states just previously. We may perhaps suppose that the scribe made a mistake, in calculation or writing, or that Elûlu was not really the same month as Ulûlu. It may have been the Amorite name for the next month.

A somewhat similar case occurs in V.A. Th. 967 [M.A.P., No. 60], where a labourer hired for a year *rêš arhi Kislîmi irûb, arha Kislîma igammarma uzzi*, "he entered at the beginning of Kislîmu, he shall complete Kislîmu and leave." Here either the term of service was really thirteen months or the scribe made a mistake. The mistake in both cases may be the same, it may be that the scribe does not mean that the term should be inclusive of the same month twice, but he has said so here certainly. These are the only two cases known to me where any such doubt arises. The general usage, as in the first example, is that the second month named is the month before that named first.

Now let us see what this method will do for the "Amorite" months. The contract V.A. Th. 974 (and its case 975) [M.A.P., No. 71] says of the tenant of a house, *arhi mahrû ša Addari ûm I(KAM-MA-NI-E) irûb, Arhi Dûr-Rammânu igammarma ûzi*, "he entered in the month supplementary to Addaru (Ve-Adar), he shall complete the month of Dûr-Rammânu and leave." Thus Dûr-Rammânu preceded Ve-Adar. This introduces a little doubt. Strictly, no doubt, we must conclude that Dûr-Rammânu was the same as Adar, but the scribe may have meant that Dûr-Rammânu preceded Adar, having a normal year in his mind. We shall return to this point later. For other references to Dûr-Rammânu the reader may consult Mr. King's note quoted above. A contract, Bu. 91-5-9, 938,

C.T. vi. 40, says of a labourer hired for a year, *arhi Dûr-Rammânu ûm IV (KAM) irûb*, *arhim Mamitim igarmarma uzzi*, "he entered on the fourth of Dûr-Rammânu, he shall complete Mamitu and leave." Hence Mamitu preceded Dûr-Rammânu.

Again, another contract, Bu. 91-5-9, 1137 [C.T. vi. 41], says of a man hired for a year, *arhi Elûlu irûb*, *arhi Tirinu ûzi*, "he entered in Elûlu, he shall leave in Tirinu." Therefore Tirinu preceded Elûlu. Mr. King's note gives three references for a month Tiru. The sign I have read *nu* may be an error for *im*. If so, the name here will be Tiru.

In a contract, S. 564, published by Professor V. Scheil in *Une Saison de fouilles à Sippar*, p. 135, we read of the man hired for a year, *arhi Šubutim ina reštišu idar arha Aiâru igarmarma ušši*, "he shall commence in the month Šubutu, he shall complete the month Aiâru and leave." Hence Aiâru preceded Šubutu. In these texts ŠU is often like SU. At any rate it is tempting to suppose that Šubutu is the same month as the Sibutu of Mr. King's note, a form which occurs also on Sennacherib's "Bellino" cylinder, and of which another variant given by Mr. King is Zibutu.

If these conclusions be correct, we have now fixed five of the "Amorite" months, viz. Rabûtu is Nisân, Šubûtu (Sibûtu, Zibûtu) is Siwân, Tiru is Âb (Elûlu being Ulûlu), Mamitu is Šebât, Dûr-Rammânu is Adar. Of the rest Kinûnu looks very like the Aramaic Kanûn, and would then answer to the Babylonian Arahsamna. That some such name for this month was known to the Assyrians is rendered likely by the personal name Kannunai, which would then be a name taken from the month of birth, like Tebêtai, Ulûlai, Adarai, etc.

In support of the likelihood of an "Amorite" month name surviving in Aramaic we may refer to Dr. Ranke's comparison of the "Amorite" personal names with Aramaic names.

The month of Šadutu, Šaddutu, Šandutu, is named in contracts to repay money, lent at various dates, to tide over the expenses of harvest. Here the money is to be repaid *ûm ebûrim arhim Šadutim*, "on the day of harvest in the month of Šadûtu." It was later than Simânu, the latest of the dates on which this species of loan is recorded, and earlier than Ulûlu, the earliest of such dates. We are, therefore, restricted to Du'ûzu for this month, Âbu being already assigned to Tiru. We even find a loan to harvest corn issued at the beginning of Du'ûzu, to be repaid on the fifteenth day [M.A.P. 15], with which may be compared another such loan to be repaid *ina isin abi*, which may mean "on the feast day of Âbu," or "the festival of Abi," and may have fallen in Šadutu [M.A.P. 14]. Further, we find from a receipt, Bu. 91-5-9 [C.T. viii. 38], that three borrowers of corn had already repaid part of their loan on the twentieth of Du'ûzu. Further evidence that Du'ûzu was then the month of corn harvest need hardly be called for. We may, therefore, conjecture that Šadûtu was the "Amorite" name of the month Tammûz. We may further remark that names like Dûr-Abi, Dûr-Rammânu, are very unlikely for month names; the word *dûru*, "a wall," does not seem likely to be part of such names. Moreover the sign read *dûr* is very liable to be confused with the sign *EZEN*, of which the Semitic value is *isinnu*, "a feast or festival." The sign *EZEN* enters rather often into the "Early Sumerian" month names given by Dr. Radau. The name given by Mr. King in his note is written very like *EZEN-a-bi*, which would then correspond with the *isin abi* quoted above. It seems preferable, therefore, to regard this as a month name and to suppose that the loan was to be repaid in that month. Unless it is another name for Šadutu or Du'ûzu, as Tiru is Âbu, we cannot place it earlier than Ulûlu, and can hardly expect the repayment postponed

much longer. It may be a fuller name for Ābu, as the "Early Sumerian" month names appear to drop the *EZEN*, or *isinnu*, on occasions. This *EZEN*, Dr. Radau thinks, may be the origin of the old Canaanite *Ethanim*, preserved by the Hebrews and found in Phoenician inscriptions (1 Kings viii. 2, Eshmunazar, etc.). It is not clear, however, that this would make the month *Isîn-abi* equivalent to *Tišrîtu* as *Ethanim* seems to have been.

Whether *Zibutu*, which we have made equal to *Sibutu*, *Šubûtu*, is the old Canaanite *Ziv* (1 Kings vi. 37), or the Phoenician *Zib*, is also open to question. The contracts of the First Dynasty present many cases of the interchange of *z* and *s*, and the *šu* in *Šubutu* may be a misreading for *zu* or *su*. Among the "Early Sumerian" names is a *ZIB-KÛ*. More evidence, however, is required before we go further.

An old name for *Simânu* is *Kuṣallu*, which seems to have survived in the Palmyrene *Kaṣlul*. The "Early Sumerian" name for *Du'ûzu* is (*AN*)-*DUMU-ZI*, which seems to be nearer *Tammûz* than *Du'ûzu*; though, recollecting the interchange of *m* and *waw*, we may suppose that a Babylonian *Dumuzi* was once in use.

On a review of the whole evidence, which rarely amounts to more than suggestion, except as to the equivalence of some seven of the "Amorite" months with the "Babylonian" and "Sumerian" months, we may say that we have some indications that this "Amorite" Calendar left its traces not only in Babylonia and Assyria (down to Sennacherib's time), but perhaps also in Canaan. It raises hopes that as the many thousands of unpublished inscriptions of the First Dynasty become available for study, we shall be able to fix other such months as *Nabru*, *Humtu*, or *Šepi* . . ., and determine whether *Elunu* is the same as *Elulu*. We may also, perhaps, find a prototype for *Abib* and *Bûl*, the other Canaanite months known from the Old

Testament, or for the other Phoenician, Aramaic, etc., months known from the inscriptions. We may obtain more light as to the exact value of the term "Amorite" used here. At any rate this unpretending sketch may serve to provoke interest in the subject.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

*NOTES FROM THE LECTURE-ROOM OF
EPICTETUS.¹*

"*I forbid you to go into the senate-house.*" "*As long as I am a senator, go I must.*" Two voices were speaking from one person—the first, pompous, coarse, despotic ; the second, refined, dry, austere. There was nothing that approached stage-acting—only a suggestion of one man swelling out with authority, and of another straightening up his back in resistance. These were the first words that I heard from Epictetus, as I crept late into the lecture-room, tired with a long journey over-night into Nicopolis.

I need not have feared to attract attention. All eyes were fixed on the lecturer as I stole into a place near the door, next my friend Arrian, who was absorbed in his notes. What was it all about ? In answer to my look of inquiry Arrian pushed me his last sheet with the names "Vespasian" and "Helvidius Priscus" scrawled large upon it. Then I knew what it meant. It was a story now nearly forty years old—which I had often heard from an old friend of my father's, Æmilius Scaurus—illustrating the duty of obeying the voice of the conscience rather than the voice of a king. Epictetus, after his manner, was throwing it into the form of a dialogue :—

¹ In the following pages, which form the first chapter of a volume probably to be published before long, all sayings assigned to Epictetus are translated or paraphrased from Arrian's record of his lectures. It has not been thought necessary to insert references or notes, which will come more appropriately in the complete work.

“*Vespasian*. I forbid you to go into the senate-house.

“*Priscus*. As long as I am a senator, go I must.

“*Vespasian*. Go, then, but be silent.

“*Priscus*. Do not ask my opinion, and I will be silent.

“*Vespasian*. But I am bound to ask it.

“*Priscus*. And I am bound to answer, and to answer what I think right.

“*Vespasian*. Then I shall kill you.

“*Priscus*. Did I ever say that I could not be killed? It is yours to kill; mine, to die fearless.”

I give his words as Arrian took them down, exactly. But the tone and the spirit are past man's power to put on paper. He flashed from Emperor to Senator like the zig-zag of lightning with a straight down flash at the end. This was always his way. He would play a thousand parts, seeming, superficially, a very Proteus; but they were all types of two characters, the philosopher and the worldling, the follower of the Logos and the follower of the flesh. Moreover, he was always in earnest, in hot earnest. On the surface he would jest like Menander or jibe like Aristophanes; but at bottom he was a tragedian. At one moment he would point to his halting leg and flout himself as a lame old grey-beard with a body of clay. In the next, he was “a son of Zeus,” or “God's own son,” or “carrying about God.” Never at rest, he might deceive a stranger into supposing that he was occasionally rippling and sparkling with real mirth like a sea in sunlight. But it was never so. It was a sea of molten metal and there was always a Vesuvius down below.

I suspect that he never knew mirth or genial laughter even as a child. He was born a slave, his master being Epaphroditus, a freedman of Nero's and his favourite, afterwards killed by Domitian. They say that this wretch caused his lameness. He was twisting his leg one day to

see how much he could bear. The boy—for he was no more—said with a smile, “If you go on, you will break it,” and then, “Did not I tell you, you would break it?” True or false, this story gives the boy as I knew the man. You might break his leg but never his will. I do not know whether Epaphroditus, out of remorse, had him taught philosophy; but taught he was, under one of the best men of the day, and he acquired such fame that he was banished from Rome under Domitian, with other philosophers of note—whether at or before the time when Domitian put his master to death I cannot say. In one of his lectures he described how he was had up before the Prefect of the City with the other philosophers: “Come,” said the Prefect, “come, Epictetus, shave off your beard.” “If I am a philosopher,” he replied, “I am not going to shave it off.” “Then I shall take your head off.” “If it is for your advantage, take it off.”

But now to return to my first lecture. Among our audience were several men of position and one at least of senatorial rank. Some of them seemed a little scandalized at the Teacher’s dialogue. But it was not likely that the Emperor would take offence. In the second year of Hadrian we were not in a Neronian or Domitian atmosphere. Moreover, our teacher was known to be on good terms with the new Emperor. Perhaps their official sense of propriety was shocked; and, in the first sentence of what follows, Epictetus may have been expressing their thoughts: “‘*So you, philosophers, teach people to despise the throne!*’ Heaven forbid! Which of us teaches anyone to lay claim to anything over which kings have authority? Take my body, take my goods, take my reputation! Take my friends and relations! ‘Yes,’ says the ruler, ‘but I must also be ruler over your convictions.’ Indeed, and who gave you this authority?”

Epictetus went on to say that if indeed his pupils were of the true philosophic stamp, holding themselves detached from the things of the body and with their minds fixed on the freedom of the soul, he would have no need to spur them to boldness, but rather to draw them back from over-hasty rushing to the grave ; for, said he, they would come flocking about him, begging and praying to be allowed to teach the tyrant that they were free, by finding freedom at once in self-inflicted death : “ Here on earth, Master, these robbers and thieves, these courts of justice and kings have the upper hand. These creatures fancy that they have some sort of authority over us, simply because they have a hold on our paltry flesh and its possessions ! Suffer us, Master, to show them that they have authority over nothing ! ” If, said he, a pupil of this high spirit were brought before the tribunal of one of the Rulers of the Earth, he would come back scoffing at such “ authority ” as a mere scarecrow : “ Why did I take so much trouble, and make so much preparation, to meet no enemy at all ? Was this his authority, this his solemn ante-room, his gentlemen of the chamber, his yeomen of the guard ! These things were nothing, and I was preparing to meet something great ! ”

On the scholar of the unpractical and cowardly type, anxiously preparing “ what to say ” in his defence before the magistrate’s tribunal, he poured a hot scorn. Had not the fellow, he asked, been practising “ what to say ”—all his life through ? “ What else,” said he, “ have you been practising ? Syllogisms and convertible propositions ! ” Then came the reply, in a whine, “ Yes, but he has authority to kill me ! ” To which the Teacher answered, “ Then speak the truth, you pitiful creature. Cease your imposture and give up all claim to be a philosopher. In the lords of the earth recognize your own lords and masters. As long as you give them this grip on you, through your flesh, so long

must you be at the beck and call of every one that is stronger than you are. Socrates and Diogenes had practised 'what to say' by the practice of their lives. But as for you—get you back to your own proper business, and never again budge from it! Get you back into your own snug corner, and sit there at your leisure, spinning your syllogisms :

' In thee is not the stuff that makes a man
A people's leader.' "

Thence he passed to the objection that a judicial condemnation might bring disgrace on one's name. "The authorities, you say, have condemned you as guilty of impiety and profanity. What harm is there in that for you? This creature, with authority to condemn you—does he himself know even the meaning of piety or impiety? If a man in authority calls day night or bass treble, do men that know take notice of him? Unless the judge knows what the truth is, his 'authority to judge' is no authority. No man has authority over our convictions, our inmost thoughts, our will. Hence when Zeno the philosopher went into the presence of Antigonus the king, it was the king (not the philosopher) that was anxious; for the king wished to gain the philosopher's good opinion, but the philosopher cared for nothing that the king could give. When, therefore, you go to the palace of a great ruler, remember that you are in effect going to the shop of a shoemaker or a grocer—on a great scale of course, but still a grocer. He cannot sell you anything real or lasting, though he may sell his groceries at a great price."

At the bottom of all this doctrine about true and false authority, there was, as I afterwards understood, a belief that God had bestowed on all men, if they would but accept and use it, authority over their own wills, so that they might conform their wills to His, as children do with a Father, and might find pleasure, and indeed their only pleasure, in

doing this, accepting all bodily pain and evil as not evil but good because it comes from His will, which must be also their will and must be honoured and obeyed. "When," said he, "the ruler says to any one, 'I will fetter your leg,' the man that is in the habit of honouring his leg cries, 'Don't, for pity's sake!' But the man that honours his will says, 'If it appears advisable to you, fetter it.'"

"*Tyrant.* Won't you bend ?

"*Cynic.* I will not bend.

"*Tyrant.* I will show you that I am lord.

"*Cynic.* You ! impossible ! I have been freed by Zeus. Do you really imagine that He would allow His own son to be made a slave ? But of my corpse you *are* lord. Take it."

In this particular lecture Epictetus also gave us a glimpse of a wider and more divine authority imparted by God to a few special natures, akin to Himself, whereby, as God is supreme King over men His children, so a chosen few may become subordinate kings over men their brethren. Like Plato, he seemed to look forward to a time when rulers would become philosophers, or else philosophers kings. Nero and Sardanapalus, Agamemnon and Alexander, all came under his lash—all kings and rulers of the old régime. Not that he denied Agamemnon a superiority to Nero, or the right to call himself "Shepherd of the people" if he pleased. "Sheep, indeed," he exclaimed, "to submit to be ruled over by you !" and "Shepherd, indeed, for you weep like the shepherds, when a wolf has snatched away a sheep !"

From these old-fashioned rulers he passed to a new and nobler ideal of kingship : "Those kings and tyrants received from their armed guards the power of rebuking and punishing wrongdoing, though they might be rascals themselves. But on the Cynic"—that was the term he used—"this power is bestowed by the conscience." Then he explained

what he meant by "conscience"—the consciousness of a life of wise, watchful, and unwearied toil for man, with the co-operation of God. "And how," he asked, "could such a man fail to be bold and speak the truth with boldness—speaking, as he does, to his own brethren, to his own children and kinsfolk? So inspired, he is no meddler or busybody. Supervising and inspecting the affairs of mankind, he is not busying himself with other men's matters, but with his own. Else, call a general, too, a busybody, when he is busy inspecting his own soldiers!"

This was, to me, quite a new view of the character of a Cynic. But Epictetus insisted on it with reiteration. The Cynic, he said, was Warrior and Physician in one. As a warrior, he was like Hercules, wandering over the world with his club and destroying noxious beasts and monsters. As a physician, he was like Socrates or Diogenes, going about and doing good to those afflicted with sickness of mind, diagnosing each disease, prescribing diet, cautery, or other remedy. In both these capacities the Cynic received from God authority over men, and men recognized it in him, because they perceived him to be their benefactor and deliverer.

There are, said Epictetus, in each man two characters—the character of the Beast and the character of the Man. By Beast he meant wild or savage beast, as distinct from tame beast, which he preferred to call "sheep." "Sheep" meant the cowardly, passive, greedy passions within us. "The Beast" meant the savage, aggressive, greedy nature, not only stirring us up to external war against our neighbours, but also waging war to the death against our inward better nature, against the "Man." The mark or stamp of the Beast he connected with Nero. "Cast it away," he said. The opposite mark or stamp he connected with the recently deceased Emperor, Trajan. If we acted like a

beast, he warned us that we should become like a beast, and then, according to his customary phrase, "*You will have lost the Man.*" And was this, asked he, nothing to lose? Over and over again he repeated it: "*You have thrown away the Man.*" It was in this light—as a type of the Man—that he regarded Hercules, the first of the Cynics, the Son of God, going on the errands of the Father to destroy the Beast in its various shapes, typifying an armed Missionary, but armed for spiritual not for fleshly warfare, destroying the Beast that would fain dominate the world. But it was for Diogenes that he reserved his chief admiration, placing him (I think) even above Socrates, or at all events praising him more warmly—partly, perhaps, out of fellow-feeling, because Diogenes, too, like himself, had known what it was to be a slave. Never shall I forget the passage in this lecture in which he described Alexander surprising the great Cynic asleep, and waking him up with a line of Homer:—

“To sleep all night suits not a Councillor,”

—to which Diogenes replied at once in the following line, claiming for himself the heavy burden—entrusted to him by Zeus—of caring like a king for all the nations of the earth:—

“Who holds, in trust, the world’s vast orb of cares.”

Diogenes was not only an Æsculapius of souls; he wielded “the sceptre and the kingdom of the Cynic.” Some have represented Epictetus as claiming this authority for himself. But in the lecture that I heard, it was not so. Though what he said might have been mistaken as a claim for himself, it was really a claim for “the Cynic,” as follows. First he put the question, “How is it possible for one destitute, naked, homeless, hearthless, squalid, with not one slave to attend him, or a country to call his own, to lead a life of

equable happiness?" To which he replied, "Behold, God hath sent unto you the man to demonstrate in act this possibility. *'Look on me, and see that I am without country, home, possessions, slaves; no bed but the ground, no wife, no children—no palace to make a king or governor out of me—only the earth, and the sky, and one threadbare cloak! And yet what do I want? Am I not fearless? Am I not free? When saw ye me failing to find any good thing that I desired, or falling into any evil that I would fain have avoided? What fault found I ever with God or man? When did I ever accuse anyone? Did anyone ever see me with a gloomy face? How do I confront the great persons before whom you, worldlings, bow abashed and dismayed? Do not I treat them as cringing slaves? Who, that sees me, does not feel that he sees in me his natural Lord and Master?'*"

I confess that up to this point I had myself supposed that he was speaking of himself, standing erect as ruler of the world. But in the next instant he had dropped, as it were, from the pillar upon which he had been setting up the King, and now, like a man at the pedestal pointing up to the statue on the top, he exclaimed, "Behold, these are the genuine Cynic's utterances: this is his stamp and image: this is his aim!"

He passed on to answer the question, What if the Cynic missed his aim, or, at least, missed it so far as exerting the royal authority over others? What if death cut his purpose short? In that case, he said, the will, the purpose, the one essential good, had at all events remained in its purity; and how could man die better than in such actions? "If, while I am thus employed, death should overtake me, it will suffice me if I can lift up my hands to God and say, 'The helps that I received from Thee, to the intent that I might understand and follow Thy ordering of the universe, these I have not neglected. I have not disgraced Thee, so

far as in me lay. See how I have used these faculties which Thou hast given me ! Have I ever found fault with Thee ? ever been ill-pleased with anything that has happened or ever wished it to happen otherwise ? Thou didst beget me, and I thank Thee for all Thou gavest me. I have used to the full the gifts that were of Thy giving and I am satisfied. Receive them back again and dispose them in such region as may please Thee. Thine were they all, and Thou hast given them unto me.'” Then, turning to us, he said, “Are you not content to take your exit after this fashion ? Than such a life, what can be better, or more full of grace and beauty ? Than such an end, what can be more full of blessing ?”

There was much more, which I cannot recall. I was no longer in a mood to note and remember exact words and phrases, and I despair of making my readers understand why. Able philosophers and lecturers I had heard before, but none like this man. Some of those had moved me to esteem and gained my favourable judgement. But this man did not “move” me. He whirled me away into an upper region of spiritual possibility, at once glad and sad—sad at what I was, glad at what I might be. Alcibiades says in the Symposium of Plato that whereas the orator Pericles had only moved his outer self to admiration, the teaching of Socrates caught hold of his very soul, “whirling it away into a Corybantic dance.” I quoted these words to Arrian as we left the lecture-room together, and he replied that they were just to the point. “Epictetus,” he said, “is a Phrygian ; and, like the Phrygian priests of Cybele, with their cymbals and their dances, he has just this power of whirling away his hearers into any region he pleases and making them feel at any moment what he wishes them to feel ; but,” added he thoughtfully, “it did not last with Alcibiades. Will it last with us ?”

I argued (or perhaps I should say urged, for it was more feeling than logic) that it would last—at all events for the world; that Socrates had exerted a lasting influence on mankind; that Diogenes, in a different way, had done the same; that it was impossible to doubt that Epictetus had a deep and loyal belief in God; and hardly possible to doubt that God was speaking to us through him. Could all this be a delusion? Even if there were some errors of detail or some dramatic hyperbole, was there not underneath these a solid truth—and a truth most salutary in those days when the Beast, in the shape of a Nero or a Domitian, might sit upon the throne and call himself Lord God and claim to be worshipped; while the true Man, the real “Son of God”—as Epictetus termed him—was liable to be called before the judgement-seat, and tried and condemned and put to death?

Arrian walked on for a while without answering. Presently he said, “This is your first lecture. It is not so with me. I, as you know, have heard Epictetus for several months, and I admire him as much as you do, perhaps more. I am sure he is doing me good. But I do not aim at being his ideal Cynic. ‘Not in me is the stuff’—I admit his censure—that makes a man into a King, bearing all the cares of all mankind upon his shoulders. My ambition is, some day, to become (as you are by birth) a Roman citizen”—he was not one then, nor was he Flavius Arrianus, but I have called him by the name by which he became known in the world—“and to do good work in the service of the Empire, as an officer of the State and yet an honest man. For that purpose I want to keep myself in order—at all events to some reasonable extent. Epictetus is helping me to do this, by making me ashamed of the foul life of the Beast, and by making me aspire to what he calls ‘the Man.’ That I feel day by day, and for that I am thankful.

“ But if you ask me about the reality of this ‘ authority,’ which our teacher claims for his Cynic, then, in all honesty, I must confess to doubts. Socrates, certainly, has moved the minds of civilized mankind. But then he had, as you know, a ‘ daemonic something ’ in him, a divine voice of some kind. And he believed in the immortality of the soul—a point on which you have not yet heard what Epictetus has to say. As to Diogenes, though I have always faithfully recorded in my notes what our teacher says about him, yet I do not feel that the philosopher of the tub had the same heaven-sent authority as Socrates, or as Epictetus himself. And, indeed, did you not yourself hear to-day that God gives us authority over nothing but our own hearts and wills ? How, then, can the Cynic claim this authority over others, except as an accident ? But I forget. Perhaps Epictetus did not mention to-day his usual doctrine about ‘ good ’ and ‘ evil,’ about ‘ peace of mind ’ and about the ‘ rule ’ of our neighbours as being ‘ no evil ’ to us. It comes in almost every lecture. Wait till you have heard this.

“ Again, as to the origin of this authority, the teacher tells us that it is given by God—or by gods, for he uses both expressions. But by what God or gods ? Is not this a matter of great importance ? Wait till you have heard him on this point. Now I must hasten back to my rooms to commit my notes to writing while fresh in my memory. We meet in the lecture-room to-morrow. Meantime, believe me, I most heartily sympathize with you in your admiration of one whom I account the best of all living philosophers. I have all your conviction of his sincerity. Assuredly, whencesoever he derives it, he has in him a marvellous power for good. The gods grant that it may last ! ”

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS OF LYCAONIA .

(Concluded.)

THE following epitaph, one of the most important and interesting of all the Lycaonian Christian documents, came before me only after the preceding article¹ was in type and passed for press. I alluded to it in a sentence appended at the end of the article. It is on a stone high up in the front wall of an early Turkish khan, on the outside beside the gateway on the left hand as one enters, in the important village of Suwerek, the ancient Psebila, where the main trade route from Ephesus and the west through Apameia and Laodiceia Katakekaumene to the eastern lands forked, one branch going due east to Caesareia and the Euphrates, the other going south-east to Savatra and the Cilician Gates.²

The khan is a very fine specimen of Seljuk work, and part of it seemed to be merely an alteration of a Byzantine church, on one of whose capitals I read the dedication in letters not of a very early period :—

. ΧΗΗΩΑΝΟΥ ΤΤΟΥ
 ἐϋ]χη Ἰωάννου [κὲ τοῦ οἴκου α]ὐτοῦ
 The vow of John and of his household.³

The building is well worth an architect's careful study.

I asked for a ladder on which to stand in order to read the inscription in the outer wall, but at the moment nothing could be procured except a rude hurdle ; and it raised me only so far that my eyes were about a foot below the lowest line of letters. The stone was upside down, and it was impossible to read more than the lowest two lines⁴ in this

¹ EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1906, p. 32ff.

² On these roads see Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 390.

³ Other restorations of the missing letters after Ἰωάννου are possible ; but the above is the most probable.

⁴ These are the first lines of the inscription.

awkward position; and, as I intended to stay for the night in the village, I postponed the task till the afternoon. Moreover, I felt confident that the lines which I could read were the beginning of an inscription published by my friend and old pupil Mr. J. G. C. Anderson; but still I wanted to get a fresh copy and to make a drawing of the stone.

Circumstances compelled a change of plan, and we left suddenly at two o'clock, without again looking at the stone in the khan wall. Returning home, I found I had made a mistake, as Mr. Anderson had not copied the inscription, and I mourned over the loss of what promised to be an interesting document. Only in December did I find the text amid those copied by another friend and old pupil, Professor T. Callander, of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. I had seen it in his notebook, and thus recognized it on the stone. Professor Callander's copy is not complete, which is not strange when the difficult position of the stone is considered; but even the half that he copied shows how interesting the text is.

Nestorios, Presbyter, lies here, who shone a star among the Churches of God ¹ [one hexameter and a half lost: Djionedes lies here.

We notice here, first of all, the reminiscence of Homer, "it shone like a star,"² showing that the composer of the epitaph was a person of some education. But far more important is the unmistakable reference to the Stars of the Apocalypse. The Stars were held in the hand of Him who walked in the midst of the Churches, symbolized by the golden lampstands. The Stars were the Angels of the Churches. Nestorios, then, was the angel who shone among the Churches of God.

¹ Νεστόριος πρεσβύτερος ἐνθάδε κίτε

ἀστὴρ ὅς ἐνέλαμπεν ἐν ἐκκλησίαισιν θεοῦ.

The *ν* before *θεοιο* makes the metre needlessly bad: cp. EXPOSITOR.

² ἀστὴρ ὡς ἀπέλαμπεν, Iliad xix. 381, and elsewhere.

The verb used by Homer, ἀπολάμπειν, (to shine forth), is varied in this epitaph to ἐνλάμπειν (to shine in), for the evident purpose of making it suit better the scene alluded to in the Apocalypse.

It seems also highly probable that the six-rayed rosette, which is so common an ornament on Christian gravestones in Lycaonia, may have been understood as the Star of the Church. The position so often assigned to the rosette on those stones, balanced symmetrically against a more or less elaborately ornate cross, seems to prove that it had a meaning in the symbolic ornamentation of Christian stones.¹ This is not at all inconsistent with our previous suggestion that it was a developed form of the monogram of I and X, implying that Jesus Christ was the Star of the Church. Rather it seems to be implied that the Presbyter (Bishop) stands to the Church in the same relation as God does, a very similar stage of thought to that which appears in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Book II., as in the quotation in EXPOSITOR, December, 1905, p. 447 f., "let the Bishop be honoured by you in the place of God." This same comparison, evidently, is employed in the epitaph with reference to Nestorios.

This seems to corroborate strongly the view which we have already stated² as to the picture of the office of Presbyter given in the Lycaonian inscriptions, and perhaps justifies us in speaking even more positively and emphatically. The term Presbyter in those inscriptions is used in very much the same sense as Hieres and Episkopos. The Presbyter was not simply one of a board of elders in the congregation; he was the head and priest and leader of

¹ It was, of course, used also as an ornament on pagan stones, as practically every Christian symbol was previously employed by pagans, as the cross, the vine-branch, etc.; but the Christian symbolism turned those pagan ornaments to its own purposes.

² EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1905, p. 448 f.

the local Church. The Presbyter administered the revenues of the Church, cared for the poor, the stranger, the widow and the orphan, and was assisted in these duties by the Deacon his subordinate.

It is also remarkable that the only clear references to or quotations from the New Testament which we have observed in these Lycaonian inscriptions are taken from the opening chapters of the Apocalypse.¹ The frequent occurrence of the name Joanes or Joannes is perhaps due to the popularity of the Apocalypse among Lycaonian Christians. It is worth noting that Joanes² is the usual, and almost invariable, spelling in Lycaonia, though Joannes sometimes occurs.

We observe here a difference in the employment of New Testament names in Lycaonia from usage elsewhere. Professor Harnack remarks³ that the names Petrus and Paulus came into popular use among the Christians in the middle of the third century, but that "even the name of John, so far as I know, only began to appear within the fourth century and that slowly." As a general principle, this is doubtless quite correct, and I have, if I recollect rightly, printed a similar observation about the Phrygian Christian inscriptions many years ago; but in regard to Lycaonia the principle must be modified. The name of John was far commoner in Lycaonia than that of Peter, though as yet John is not definitely proved in popular use before the beginning of the fourth century. Petrus occurs twice and Kephias once, so far as I have observed, in Lycaonia in inscriptions of the fourth century, and Petrus twice in an inscription which perhaps belongs to the third century⁴; but

¹ Another in EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1905, p. 443.

² As in the example quoted previously in this article.

³ *Expansion of Christianity*, transl., ii. p. 42 f., cp. p. 35.

⁴ At Nova Isaura: see *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 284.

Joanes occurs frequently. Paulus and Mirus are the commonest names in the Lycaonian Christian inscriptions. John and Thekla stand far behind them, nearly equal in frequency, and superior in that respect to almost all other names.

A few remarks may here be added as regards the personal names used in Lycaonia. We take first the names occurring apart from Nova Isaura, where the epitaphs are of an earlier period. (1) Many names connected with the story of Thekla are found in the Christian inscriptions. Of course Thekla is the commonest: ¹ Falconilla occurs at Laodiceia, No. 92 ²; Onesiphoros (with wife Hexis and daughter Gnome) at Laodiceia, No. 90; Tryphaina in an unpublished inscription (of Akdje-Shahr, three miles south-east from Suwerek).

(2) Similarly the names Timotheos, Paulus and Paula, Julia Paula, Lucius, Petros,³ Marcus, Joannes,⁴ Kephas, Joseph, Maria, Sousanna, Onesimus, Stephanos, Michael, have been probably all derived from the Bible (including the Apocrypha), though of course some of them might be explained from the custom of ordinary pagan society.

The names of Gaius Julius Paulus and Julia Paula call for a note in passing. The Apostle Paul, a Roman citizen, son of a Roman, had of course a full Roman name, *praenomen* and *nomen* as well as the *cognomen* Paulus: that stands above all doubt or question. Now there was no Roman more popular among the Jews than Julius Caesar,

¹ Besides less certain examples, see Anderson in *Journ. of Hell. Stud.*, 1898, p. 127, No. 90, and 1899, pp. 291 f., Nos. 200, 202, Laodiceia, No. 81 (*Ath. Mitth.* 1888, p. 259), and others.

² *Mitth. Athen.* 1888, p. 262, where it is necessary to correct the reading to Φαλκωνί[λ]η συνβίω.

³ Lucius, son of Peter, Deacon at Laodiceia, No. 62, probably 320-350, Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.* No. 116.

⁴ On the spelling, which is regularly Joanes, and not Joannes, see above.

none who showed them more favour, none for whose death they so mourned. I think that I have somewhere many years ago suggested the possibility that the Apostle's father got the Roman citizenship from Caesar, who visited Tarsus in 47 B.C. In that case he would have taken the name Gaius Julius, and the *nomen* Julius would necessarily descend to his son, probably also the *praenomen* Gaius. It is certainly a coincidence not without interest and suggestiveness that the *nomen* twice occurs along with the *cognomen* Paulus or Paula in the Lycaonian inscriptions, and that no other Roman *nomen* is found associated with Paulus among them.¹

(3) A very large class contains the names which were chosen as giving a good Christian meaning: Valentilla and Valentina, Nonna, Sanbathos, Kyriakos, Kyrilla, Genesios, Eusebios, Photinus, Eutyichios, Eugenios, Elpidius, Sophronia, Theoktista, Theophilus, Faustinus, Eirene, Theodoulos, Dositheos, Mnesitheos, Hesyehios, Aphthonios, Pansemnion, Ambrosios, Anenkletos, Hilarios, Patricius, Polykarpos, Karpiana, Eudromios, Gregorios, Eugnesios, Anicetus, Euagrios, Onesimos, Candidus, Irenaios, Doxa, Akmazon, Zotikos, Zosimos, Philete, Martyrios. Some of these probably were spread by historical reasons, as being the names of martyrs or heroes of the Church, such as Polykarpus, Irenaios, Onesimos. The name Miros is very common in Lycaonian usage, the most frequent of all except Paulus in the inscriptions. It might be explained as belonging

¹ But it must, on the other hand, not be forgotten that Julius is far the most common Roman *nomen* used in these inscriptions; and the name C. Julius Paulus is therefore quite explicable as a simple chance coincidence. The point is, up to the present, merely one to observe and record, in view of further discoveries; but if two or three other cases of Julius Paulus and Julia Paula should be found, the coincidence would cease to be explicable by mere chance and would become a piece of real evidence. Incidentally, this shows how important it would be to explore Lycaonia with proper care and thoroughness: these inscriptions might give us the full name of the Apostle.

to the following class, for the name of Meiros or Meros was given to a city of Phrygia, and must, therefore, have been native Phrygian. But perhaps the Christians understood the personal name as the Latin adjective *mirus*, wonderful, and saw in the name a reference to the never-ending wonder of Christian salvation.

(4) Comparatively rare are true native Phrygian or Lycaonian names, e.g. Sadas, Vanalis, Indakos, Inzas, Tas, Gourdos, Papas, Mamas, and others. These are for the most part confined to the inscriptions of Nova Isaura ; but they occur sporadically in all parts of Lycaonia during the fourth century. Along with them may be ranked many common Greek or Latin names (apart from some in the previous class, which might be also counted here, Theophilus, Dositheos, etc.), Neon, Gais (i.e. Gaius), Gaieina, Orestina, Romanus, Matrona, Himeios, Augusta, Domna, Prokla, Laodice, Konon, Demetrius, Diomedes, Diocles, Diogenes, Castor, Polychronios, Abascantus, Montanus, Apollinarius, Apollonius, Alexander, Basilas, Basilissa, Nestor, Antonius. Some of these remained in use because they had been in common use in ordinary society ; some were aided in persisting because saints or martyrs had borne them : some were Biblical also, like Gaius and Alexander. But the last, which was widely used by Christians in Phrygia and Lycaonia, probably persisted because it had also been common among the Jews, who favoured the names of Julius Caesar and Alexander, as being directly or indirectly benefactors.¹

It might be asked to what class the name Nestorios belongs, and whether its use in this inscription furnishes any proof of date. It is unlikely that the name was used much in the orthodox Church after the Nestorian heresy ;

¹ The Jews of the Greek cities found that the successors of Alexander were often very favourable to them. See my *Letters to the Seven Churches*, hc. xii. ; *Cities and Bish., of Phrygia*, ii. p. 672.

and a bishop or leader of that Church is not likely to have retained the name Nestorios after the Council of Ephesus in 431 had condemned the great Nestorios. Therefore, unless this epitaph commemorates a leader in some heterodox sect (which is, of course, quite possible, but certainly less probable), it cannot safely be dated later than the early years of the fifth century. The formula and the style of lettering mark the inscription as one of the latest that have been reviewed in these articles; and thus again we find the principle confirmed on which we have been dating the general body of inscriptions: they are, with rare exceptions, not later than the fourth century.

A new visit to Suwerek, with a longer ladder, to get a complete copy of this inscription, is now a matter of importance. An impression in paper, which was made by one of my servants, a clever workman, proved valueless, as the letters are so faint that they leave only very faint traces on the paper. Nothing but a copy from the stone would be of much use. To make such a copy necessitates two days' journey, and therefore considerable expense for a single inscription, as the neighbourhood of Suwerek has been pretty thoroughly explored in the last two years, and one would not otherwise be inclined to revisit the place so soon.

The epitaphs of Nova Isaura present a striking contrast in respect of personal names. I need not repeat the evidence as collected elsewhere,¹ but merely quote the main results. There names of distinctively Christian character are extremely rare on the monuments that have architectural ornament. The list has Petros twice in one inscription, Doxa once, and Paulos once. Nestor, which also occurs, became a very popular Christian name in Lycaonia. But the overwhelming mass of names are pure Anatolian. When

¹ See Miss Ramsay's paper in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 290 f.

those monuments were erected Christian society was only beginning to differentiate itself from ordinary pagan society in respect of names ; but already a considerable amount of Christian symbolism of a more or less cryptic character can be traced on the monuments.¹ They have to be placed in a distinctly earlier period than the mass of the Lycaonian Christian inscriptions, and I become more convinced as study progresses that they belong for the most part to the third century.

The long metrical inscription from Nova Isaura, often quoted in the preceding article, may now be given in full, not that I have succeeded in completely restoring it, but in the hope that others may aid by suggestions.

I described in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 349, the circumstances which made my copy in 1901 defective and unsatisfactory. In 1905 I saw the inscription again, but it had suffered much in the interval. My eyes are not sensitive to very delicate effects, and I should be accompanied on another visit by some persons with sharper eyes for faint lines. This stone also lies far away from the pressing needs of exploration and would require two long days of travelling and one day of work to copy it properly. Such conditions add immensely to the cost of a single inscription, but this one would reward the expense. The stone is broken down the middle, and on the right and left sides, but complete at top and bottom. Only a facsimile would be sufficient to give a fair idea of the state of the text, as the surface is often broken in parts.²

I have never known an inscription in which so many

¹ I take into account several other inscriptions of the same class which were found during 1905.

² The Greek text, published in *Journ. of Hell. Stud.*, 1905, p. 349, from a hasty and imperfect copy, must be here repeated from a better copy made in May, 1905. I have received much help from Mr. J. G. C. Anderson and from Professor Sanday ; and to them several of the best resto-

letters are preserved yet so much of the meaning remains entirely obscure, and restoration is so difficult. There seems to be no proper connexion between the parts, and thus the restorer has no foundation to work on. Accordingly I have been forced at last to the hypothesis—almost the last refuge of despair—that the second line is misplaced. The first line is engraved on the square capital of the stone (which is shaped like an ornate altar). Then I conjecture that the following second and third hexameters were engraved on the shaft of the stone, and that the stone-cutter accidentally omitted the fourth hexameter. Finding his error too late, he engraved the omitted words on the retreating face between the first line and the second.¹ It is

rations here given are due, even though not mentioned in every case.

- σῆματι τῷδ' ἐνέπω παρίοντι φ[. . .]οε χαίρειν
 θ or χ]ρόνοισι **ΑΙ ΙΟ C** ἱέρε[υεν] ἀρο[ύρης]
ΑΙΟC· ἐνοῖς· σύ δέ μοι χαρίσαιο προσελθῶν,
 καὶ [πεισθ]εῖς [ἐπ]έεσσι, μαθῶν δὲ σαφῶς ὅτι Νέστωρ
 5 σεμνὸς πρεσβύ]τερος, μετρίων χηρῶν ἐπαρωγός·
 τῷ ?]τ' ἀρ' ἀπ' ἐν]κρατιῆς ὁ διάκονος ἐσθλὸς ὑπουργός
 Πεισιδικ]ῆς θησαυρὸς ἐπαρχίης ἐπιλεκτος
 Δό[μνος Πανσ]ανίου ὁ διδάσκαλος ἠιθέοισιν.
 καὶ σοφὸς [ἐν μερόπ]εσσι δικασπολος ἐπλετο πιστός
 10 ἠγεμόσιν ξ[υνέδ]ρευε τ'· Γ]σασι δὲ μυρία φύλα.
 καὶ μνησθεῖς φιλότητος ἐμ[ῆς κεδν]ῆς σοφίης τε
 σπε[ύ]σεν ἐμοὶ στενάχων ἀπὸ σωματος, ἔμπάλι χαίρων
 ἠμετέρης φιλίης μεμνημεν[ος ἡμα]τα <πα>πάντα
 τὴν σεμνὴν φιλαδελφόν **C** ο π[αρακοι]τ]ιν ἀρίστην
 15 Τηλεφιδην Μαμμεῖν ἠῖε· σων
 πιστὴν ἐνκρατῆς οἰκονομον **C** προν]οίας
 μνήμη(συν)ῆς μ[νή]μης [τ]ε χάριν [θ]εράπενα[ν Ἰησοῦ]
 ἦτος χαρ[ιεντ]ῆος ἐν ὑμνοῖς
 τεῖσεν ἀπὸ σφετ[ερ]
 20 μνη]ματ' ἀ[γ]αλληάσουσι καὶ ἐσσομένοισ[ι] πυθέσθαι

In l. 4 Dr. Sanday suggests T[ερφθ]εις, which is closer to the copy T . . . OEIC (with note that ΦEIC is possible).

¹ The opening lines would then be as follows :—

σῆματι τῷδ' ἐνέπω παρίοντι φ[. . .]οε χαίρειν
 πᾶσι παρερχο]μενοις· σύ δέ μοι χαρίσαιο προσελθῶν
 καὶ [πεισθ]εῖς [επ]έεσσι μαθῶν δὲ σαφῶς ὅτι Νέστωρ
 χ]ρόνοισι ἱέρευεν ἀρούρης
 σεμνὸς πρεσβύ]τερος, μετρίων χηρῶν ἐπαρωγός.

not a rare thing to find words thus omitted in an inscription and added at the side or the end. Where the inscription is complete, the correct order can easily be detected (though some strange errors have been made in publishing inscriptions that contain such misplaced letters or words, because the editor failed to notice the misplacement). Here, where the inscription is incomplete, and where there are lacunae both at beginning and end of every line, and sometimes also in the middle of the lines, the difficulty is almost insuperable, especially as the hexameters do not correspond to the lines of the engraved text. Elsewhere I have pointed out more than once that the engraver of such epitaphs generally had a written copy to work from. Thus it comes about that the misplaced words here are not exactly a hexameter. There is generally a little more than a hexameter in each line of the text.

If we try to correct the misplacement, the meaning of the first five hexameters would be :—

By this sign (or stone) I bid the passer hail, and all who go
by ; but do thou show me favour, approaching,

A salutation to the passers-by is a common feature in ancient epitaphs : it was sometimes placed at the end, sometimes at the beginning. Such salutations were taken over from pagan custom into early Christian epitaphs. In the present case the use of the salutation must be regarded as a sign of comparatively early date. The salutation was evidently closely connected in construction with the following line :—

and [hearkening] to my words and learning clearly that
Nestor [.] was priest in these lands [a revered
Presby]ter, the help of poor widows.

The description of the duties and position of Nestor as Presbyter, and several other points of interest in the epitaph,

have already been discussed in this series of articles (EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1905, p. 444 ff., p. 453 note; see also the original imperfect publication in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 169 ff.).

The restoration of the opening two words is taken from another metrical Christian epitaph of Lycaonia (*Journal of Hell. Stud.*, 1902. The tendency of these Lycaonian epitaphs to stereotype the same formulae has been often noticed. The letters OEX in this first line are given only in my first copy. On the second occasion, after the stone had suffered more, I could not read them. As the letters are generally very faint and worn, it is always possible to regard *O* in the copy as Θ , *C* as ϵ , and so on.

Then follow three lines describing a certain Deacon, Do[mnos], son of [Paus]anias.¹ Domnos must probably be taken as having been the subordinate minister and companion of Nestor, in the same way as, in the inscription quoted above,² Trokondas was the Deacon and afterwards the successor of Gourdos. In both cases, probably the Deacon made the tomb of the Presbyter. We notice here that the task of instructing the young³ seems to belong to the Deacon, doubtless as part of his official duties.

[And to him] he who by reason of self-control was his Deacon, excellent subordinate, select treasure⁴ of the Pisidian province, Domnos, son of [Paus- or Ann-]anias, teacher for the young [made the tomb ?].

Next comes a further description of Nestor, telling that

¹ Both names are uncertain; but Domnos is at least very probable, whereas Pausanias seems unsuitable. Possibly Annanias would be nearer the truth.

² EXPOSITOR. Dec. 1905, p. 455.

³ $\eta\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, strictly a young man, seems here to be used vaguely and incorrectly in the sense of child.

⁴ In my former publication of this inscription from my first very incomplete copy, the word "treasure" was printed "treasurer." This was an ingenious "correction," introduced after the proofs had left my hands.

he was a wise and trustworthy expounder of law among men, and sate as an assessor to governors,¹ and many nations know this.

The second line² seems to imply that the Presbyter was Hiercus of the country, i.e. a territorial Bishop; but the line is too fragmentary to give any confidence. Something in the way of civic and political authority is attributed to the Presbyter, as assessor to governors (which clearly implies episcopal authority); this, as we saw above, was the case with the Bishop of Isaura in Basil's letter.

Here the wife of Nestor seems to begin to speak, mentioning her affection and love, from which he had passed away. But these lines are too obscure to translate even conjecturally, though many phrases can be caught. She is described in three lines of accusatives, as his "holy brother-loving³ excellent consort, trusty administrator of continence and forethought."

The tag at the end is found often in these metrical epitaphs, "[made] the tomb for future men, too, to learn with rejoicing." But ἀ[γ]αλλιόσουσι, which is an addition to the common tag, is difficult, and may be misread. The letters are very faint, and my copy has K not Γ. Dr. Sanday suggests καὶ παράγουσι; but this seems too long. The faint letters may be miscopied, but I can guarantee the number.

The hymns in the third last line may be some sort of service for the dead, or at the grave, as Mr. J. G. C. Anderson

¹ I give Mr. Anderson's restoration. Dr. Sanday subsequently sends the suggestion ξ[υρεών· τὰδ'], reaching a similar meaning by a perhaps preferable way.

² The fourth hexameter in our conjectural rearrangement.

³ Possibly this may imply that she was sister of the Deacon Domnos: though the reading Τηλεφίδην is certain, I suspect that ἡδε φίλην was intended by the composer. Telephides is a masculine patronymic, and does not go well with the feminine name Mammeis.

suggests, quoting an unpublished Christian epitaph of Phrygia, in which the maker of the tomb "sends up holy hymns."¹

Here, if our restoration approximates to the truth, the verb *ιερεύειν* is used to designate the duty of the Presbyter.

Mr. Anderson ingeniously restores l. 12 *σπεῖσειν ἐμοὶ στεναχῶν ἀπὸ [ἐ]ῶ[ν στηθεω]ν, πάλι χαίρων*, "and remembering my love and my trusty prudence, he made offering of lamentations from his breast, rejoicing again when he recollected our friendship through all days."

The phrase "Handmaid of Jesus," if correctly restored, is like several which were quoted in the *EXPOSITOR*, December, 1905, p. 50. Professor Sanday most ingeniously led the way to it by conjecturing *θεράπειναν* from my second copy **OCΡΑΠΕΝΑ**. Afterwards I found that his conjecture was confirmed by my first copy **OEPAΠEHA**. Phrases like "servant of Christ or Jesus" are so common in the Lycaonian inscriptions that the above conjecture may be regarded as approximating to certainty. I add another example of the formula from an epitaph at Suwerek, copied both by Professor T. Callander in 1904 and by me in 1905.

An excellent priest (lit. offerer of prayer) of God lies here, beloved of his people, and obedient to God, most gentle of all and bearing the name Anicetus, being priest of his own gentle people, loving God, loving order, companion of Christ, ever elect of God (or elect citizen of God). And this tomb his children (made).²

¹ ὕμνους σεμνοὺς ἀναπέμπει.

² ἀρητήρ ἰσθλὸς τοῦ θεοῦ κίτ' ἐνθάδε παιδῶν
ἀρεστός καὶ θεοῦ φιλήκοος
πραὺς **OC** πάντων καὶ τούνομα Ἀνίκητος
εἰερεὺς ὦν ἰδιοπραέων φιλόθεος φιλέννομος
σπᾶν Χριστοῦ ἐγλεκτός δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ. τύνβον δὲ τοῦτον τέκνα.

Perhaps we should read *πρά[τ(ατ)]ος*, supposing that **C** is an error for **T**. Possibly *ἄριστος*, not *ἀρεστός*, was intended. *ιδιοπραεων* is desperate, but the letters seemed certain: it may be intended as a compound with

I should have been disposed to assign this inscription to the fifth century, as it contains a late form of the letter delta ; but the concluding words seem to preserve a trace of the ancient formula. The inscription is complete, and the ancient formula in which the children ought to be named, was therefore never engraved in full ; but if the composer intended to use the old form, and only lack of space prevented its completion, our chronological principle would oblige us to date the epitaph near the end of the fourth century.

As has been indicated already (EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1905, p. 441 f., cp. Jan., p. 50 f.) we regard all the phrases, οἰκητης θεοῦ, παῖς Ἰ[ησοῦ] Χριστοῦ, Χριστοῦ θεράπιον, ὀπάων Χριστοῦ, as being older than the time when δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ was accepted in common usage as the right phrase and stereotyped in Byzantine usage, as shown by numerous inscriptions. The last was one of a number of varieties which are found in current use during the fourth century ; and it gradually established itself, while the others fell into disuse.

If the alternative reading “elect citizen of God” could be adopted—and it may very probably be right—we should have here an interesting trace of the early thought that the Christians were “citizens of an elect city” or “citizens of heaven.”¹

The metre in this epitaph is unusually rough : it seems to be a mixture of hexameters and iambs, and to be intended as lyrical in style.

the meaning stated in the translation. My copy has ΔΕΤΟV; Professor Callander has ACTOV, and he suggests ἀστός: this is very tempting, and I should conjecture that the intention was ἀστος τοῦ, where the double το led to the omission of a syllable, as perhaps in l. 3.

¹ ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολίτης is the beginning of the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, bishop of Hieropolis of Phrygia in the second century: see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 443.

One other epitaph from Suwerek must be added, as, if my rather bold restoration be on the right lines, it is of special interest; and I should be glad to elicit either criticism or corroboration.

Aurelius Alexander [son of Alexander ?], hoping in the after-life and joy, while living and of sound mind, made for himself a resting-place in remembrance.¹

This is an epitaph of the earliest class, and may quite probably belong to the third century. The formula is of the early style, and the use of Aurelius as *praenomen* was noted already² as far commoner in the third century than in the fourth.

The examples which have been quoted in this paper are the most striking among the body of Lycaonian Christian inscriptions; but the results of systematic collection and study would far surpass these scattered illustrations. These specimens have been given, partly to show what important results might be obtained by properly-equipped exploration in Lycaonia, partly to prevent those who refuse to help in this urgent work from excusing themselves on the ground that they did not know the situation. I do not wonder that the professed adherents of the Churches refuse to contribute the few pounds annually needed to carry this work to completion, and reveal or prove the records of early Christian history, while they lavishly contribute to every struggle against their fellow-Christians of other Churches—for that is, after all, only human nature; but I do some-

¹ Ἀὐρ. Ἀλέξανδρ[ος δῖς,
ἐλπίσας ἐπι[τῆς ἐπει-
τα ζωῆς χαρᾶ[ς τε ζῶν κ-
αὶ φρονῶν κατεσκεύασε
αὐτῷ κοιμητήριον τοῦτο
μνήμης χάριν.

There seems hardly room for so long a verb as *κατεσκεύασεν*.

² EXPOSITOR, 1905.

times wonder that they consider this and other forms of preference of the shadow before the substance, and of ignorance before knowledge, to be consistent with Christian nature.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE PRAYER OF PERFECTION.

MYSTICAL writers define mental prayer to be "the elevation of the spirit into God." It is the *Sursum corda* of the ancient Church, the *oratio pura* of the solitaries of the desert. Its practice was enjoined in the first age of Christianity. The primitive monks constantly affirmed that "the supreme degree of all perfection consists in the perfection of prayer"; seeing that, more than any other religious exercise, interior prayer strips the mind of images and forms, denudes it of individual and secular interest and lifts it up out of the bondage of self into the free love of God. Castilian, Scholasticus, Nilus, Benedict, Bernard, Aquinas, and most of the great doctors agree on this point. But the established practice of interpreting the gradual ascent in terms borrowed from the life of prayer characterized pre-eminently the ascetic writers of the first half of the seventeenth century, particularly those of Spain.

The schemes of mental prayer set forth in the several mystical writings of that period vary considerably. Castanza's classification is one of the simplest. He notes two states of prayer—meditation and contemplation. Meditation is a *seeking*, contemplation a *seeing* of God. Balthazar Alvarez, of the Society of Jesus, distinguishes the prayer of supplication, of meditation, and of silence. Santa Teresa enumerates four degrees—mental prayer, the prayer of quiet, the prayer of union, and ecstatic prayer. Other divisions are often amazingly cumbrous, the writers having fallen into the patent error of identifying their fleeting experiences with the fixed law of spiritual progress.

In general, however, the ascetic theologians of the Counter Reformation associate the several states of mental prayer with the chief powers of the rational nature—the understanding, the will, and the affections.

Christian mysticism has always been in bondage to the psychology of Plotinus. A more exact discrimination of the powers of the soul in their nature and exercise would, by bringing the mystical creed into stricter harmony with the ordinary experience of mankind, make it more generally intelligible.

Plotinus taught that the two soul-relations—the sensitive and the rational natures—meet in the act of representation; and that the powers of the superior soul flow into an unmingled unity in the realization of God. That *clearness of the soul* in which the Deity has His dwelling is variously named: it is called the apex, the supreme point of the spirit, the summit of the mind, the essence of the soul, the ground, the depth and centre of the spirit, the stable foundation of the soul, the entire state, etc. Tauler says of it, “The ground or centre of the soul is so high and glorious a thing that it cannot properly be named, even as no adequate name can be found for the Infinite and Almighty God. In this ground lies the image of the Holy Trinity”; the Divine image in which man was created at first, to which he has been restored through grace.

According to the Plotinist, therefore, mental prayer, as it marks the ascent to God, has this office committed to it, to elevate the sense-life into the life of reason, and to plunge the life of reason into the life of God. This dual task is accomplished by inward recollection,

“ When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home,”

and by the practice of the presence of God.

Mental prayer, as has just been said, is commonly defined with reference to the faculties of the superior soul. It is described in the first instance as the *prayer of discourse*,

afterwards as the *prayer of good acts*, and finally as the *prayer of infused aspirations*.¹

I. Meditation, or discursive prayer, lies within that region in which the understanding^v operates. Contemplationists do not agree as to the place which petition, whether for oneself or for others, should hold in relation to those who follow the inward way. Some plainly declare that "the prayer of supplication is to be forbidden to contemplatives : it is not for interior souls." Others are content to admit its legitimacy, but solely as an initial exercise, to be departed from as soon as may be. Others again recognize it only when it has been carried up into the prayer of silence, in which prayer the soul presents itself to God in quietness, framing no definite request, but disposing itself in a tacit consent of love before the Sovereign Will.

Even in its higher reaches meditation is the least perfect degree of internal prayer. The aspirant directs his mind to the consideration of one or more of the mysteries of the faith, in order that by "a serious and exact search into the several points and circumstances of it he may extract motives of good affections." At first, the thought of sin, of death, and of judgment, should be allowed to engross the mind. Such themes give birth to repentance. Afterwards, the consideration of the love of God, the remembrance of the passion of Christ, the anticipation of future glory, quicken faith. Repentance is the purgation of the soul, faith its illumination. Discursive prayer generates motives of contrition and affiance. These work in the mind until, on the one hand, the recognition of inbred evil, together with the recollection of the Divine purity, produce hatred of sin and a vehement longing to escape from its

¹ This is the scheme of Austin Baker, whose numerous treatises on the Interior Life were epitomized by Serenus Cresse in *Sancta Sophia*, published in 1657.

thrall; and on the other hand, our understandings are settled in pure faith. "Faith," says Aquinas, "has this property, to elevate the soul to God, and free it from all creatures." Castaniza adds, "So long as there are discourses in our understanding, images in our memory, joys or tenderness in our will, these powers have for their object not pure God but sensible things." And Gerson frames in more scriptural terms a similar remark. He says, "Though I have spent forty years in reading and prayer, yet I could never find anything more efficacious or compendious for attaining to mystical theology than that our spirit should become like a young child and beggar in the presence of God."

The aim of meditation, therefore, is to raise us to simpler representations and more general conceptions, to enable us increasingly to regard the sacred mysteries in their inward meaning, rather than in their relations and circumstances; so that by a gradual abstraction from things created we may learn to apprehend God in the singleness of His perfections. Thus faith becomes "pure without representations or likeness, simple without reasonings, and universal without distinctions."

According to the theologians one ought not to continue long in this state of prayer. "An internal soul," says Francesca Lopaz of Valenza, "ought to act rather with the affection of the will than with the toil of the intellect." As soon as it has been found that the will has become "so well affected that it is rendered facile in producing good affections and impulses," one should pass on to the prayer of good acts.

II. The prayer of good acts concerns the will. Such acts are efficacious in proportion as they are simple. Their use is "to empty us of ourselves"; little by little God takes possession of a surrendered soul, until at last "all is

yielded up to the Author of all, and God reigns supreme over our nothingness.”

Meditation must now be wholly laid aside. Even the passion of Christ must not be dwelt upon. It is necessary that we should purge the mind of those images and forms which come up from the lower soul, that so we may gather our impulses into “direct piercing intents.” It was probably round this point that the Quietist controversy gathered. The ground of debate was ostensibly the doctrine of pure love. But the orthodoxy of Rome is always practical, and a shrewd observer writing in those days from Italy relates that vast numbers of good Catholics were beginning to follow the inward way, and adds significantly, “If these persons were observed to become more strict in their lives, more retired and serious in their mental devotions, yet there appeared less zeal in their whole deportment as to the exterior parts of the religion of that Church. They were not so assiduous at mass, nor so earnest to procure masses to be said for their friends; nor were they so frequently either at confessions or at processions; so that the trade of those who live by these things was sensibly sunk.”

In 1687 Molinos’ sixty-eight propositions were condemned. In 1689 Antonio de Rojas’ *Life of the Spirit Approved* was placed on the Index. In 1699 certain propositions found in Fénelon’s *Maximes des Saints* were declared to be erroneous. The formal ground of condemnation may be inferred from the following sentences: “It is necessary that a man should annihilate his native powers: this is life eternal.” “To wish to exert one’s personal activity is to offend God.” “He who has given up his free-will to God ought to have no care about anything, neither hell nor paradise; nor ought he even to have any desire for his own perfection; hope of his own salvation ought to be driven away.” Mystics

claim an extraordinary licence of speech, and it would not be difficult to collect from various sources a multitude of citations which stand in need of interpretation as much as these do. For instance, Benet Canfield, author of that famous book, known in England as *The Bright Starre*, goes to the brink of pannihilism. Pure love, he holds, is won when “the man himself, and all other things—meditation, knowledge, desire, prayer, and the practice of a holy life—are cast asleep and are made nothing.” But a more careful and just statement of a doctrine, which is as old as Christian mysticism, is presented by Father John Evangelist of Balduke, a Flemish Capuchin, author of a very remarkable treatise entitled *The Kingdom of God in the Soul*. He affirms that abnegation consists of three successive acts, (a) From all creatures ; (b) From oneself ; (c) From the gifts of God. “Pure love to God,” he continues, “consists in this that a man deny absolutely all created things, and reason, and deliver up himself wholly unto God without intending thereby any merit, comfort, profit or any other benefit, temporal or spiritual . . . This love is pure, for it beholdeth God only in Himself.” The essential error of the doctrine of pure love, as mystically understood, is that such love, by the renunciation of all joy, tenderness, longing, ceases to be love, and becomes indifference.

In the prayer of good acts the internal working may for a time be helped by speech. The author of *The Clowde of Unknowynge* gives this counsel: “Take thee a sharp, strong cry of prayer—one word is better than two, and if that word be short, such a word as ‘Sin’ or ‘God,’ it is well.” Francis of Assisi used to spend whole nights repeating only these words, *Deus meus et omnia*. Didacus Martinez, the Apostle of Peru, used sometimes to utter six hundred times a day the single phrase, *Deo gratias*. It is related of Brother Masseus, of the Order of St, Francis, that for a

considerable time he did nothing but ejaculate U, U, U (one of the letters of the alphabet); this he said was an aspiration given to him by God. Sooner or later, however, in the experience of the proficient vocal prayer ceases to be helpful. Gregory Lopez, "incarnate seraph and deified man," as Molinos terms him, continued for three years in the use of an ejaculation, *Thy will be done in time and in eternity*, "repeating it as often as he breathed." But at the end of that time "God Almighty discovered to him that infinite treasure of the pure and continued act of faith and love, with silence and resignation." From that hour during thirty-six remaining years his prayer was in inward silence—silence of word, of thought, and of feeling.

It is by the reduction of distinct acts of recollection to one all-absorbing act that the contemplative enters into the prayer of interior silence. In this mode of prayer the soul, having a bare and obscure faith that God is indeed present to and in her, presents herself before Him, and with all love and humility, continues in His presence, yielding herself unreservedly to His will, without self-interest or concern.

III. The prayer of silence prepares for the prayer of infused aspirations. In the cessation of self-activity God takes possession of the yielded soul, initiating and ruling its proper movements, and from time to time substituting His own operation in the place of personal activity. For in this last degree of prayer there are two modes. In the former the soul still acts, but it acts in dependence on the movements of grace. The latter is in pure passivity.

(1) In this prayer the mind is free from all intuition of images; it is undistinguished by any succession of words or acts of perception, but is uttered internally in "a soft and delicate whisper," which is made known "by an inflamed intention of the mind," by an unutterable excess of affection and inconceivable quickness and alacrity of spirit,

and by blind elevations of the will which engulf it more and more profoundly in God. Now also the soul loses all remembrance of herself, and of created things, and all that she retains of God is a remembrance that He can neither be seen nor comprehended. All creatures, therefore, being removed, and no distinct image of God received, there remains in the soul and mind, as it were, a mere emptiness, and this *nothing* is worth more than all creatures, for it is all that we can know of God in this life.

Now the soul has entered the Divine darkness, wherein lie many aridities, and especially that great desolation which mystical writers call "hell." For in introversion it is with the soul as it would appear to the natural eye were the atmosphere of this earth withdrawn. Where the direct ray fell there would be unshadowed brightness, but beyond the straight lines of light there would be unrelieved obscurity. The soul which has reached this stage in its upward progress is denuded of all secondary knowledge of God. Hence, when the Divine Presence is obscured there is no remedy in reflection, representation, or remembrance, seeing that all the energies of the soul have been concentrated in one direct act of adherence to God.

When the spiritual vision becomes attuned to the ineffable ray the soul sees the Divine darkness to be most excellent and dazzling in brightness. When she begins to perceive this, she has come into the state of perfection—"a blessed state of a perfect denudation of spirit, an absolute internal solitude, a transcending and forgetfulness of all created things, and especially of oneself, a heavenly-mindedness and fixed attention to God only, and this even in the midst of employments to others never so distractive, and finally an experimental knowledge of all the infinite perfections of God, and a strict application of one's spirit by love, above knowledge, joined with a fruition and repose in

Him in the whole extent of one's will, so that the soul becomes after an inexpressible manner a partaker of the Divine nature ; yea, one spirit, one will, one love with Him, being in a sort deified, and enjoying as much of heaven here as mortality is capable of."

(2) Within this state of perfection there are unions of ecstasies which are purely passive. These unions are seldom granted to any one who has not reached full maturity. For the way is long and tedious, and there are many degrees of attainment to be won. But Catharine of Siena and some others were in their younger years favoured with a passive union. Such unions are usually brief. Seuse says they last but a moment ; Bernard judges that they seldom continue longer than a quarter of an hour. Yet they are very fruitful in the graces of the Spirit. Some of the consequences which flow from passive union are, a most clear assurance of Christian verity imparted to the soul, a penetrating insight into the scope and purpose of Holy Scripture, a marvellous purity conferred on the affections and the will, the entire subjugation of the imagination and other internal senses by the superior soul, and finally the obliteration of distinction in the singleness of approaching perfection.

Henry of Herph preserves an account which one Roger, a devout Franciscan, gave of himself, saying that a hundred times in matins he was in spirit drawn upward to a more high knowledge of Divine secrets, all which "tracts" he forcibly resisted, being assured that if he had given his soul free scope he would have been so deeply engulfed in the abyss of the Divine incomprehensibility, and so wholly drawn out of himself, that he should never have been able to have retired himself alive from such a contemplation.

A devout student of the New Testament with some understanding of the method of interior prayer might follow with general approval the mystical doctrine of the gradual

ascent of the soul to God, as it was defined by the contemplationists of the seventeenth century. He would concur with them in marking as the first, second, and third stages of progress a lively apprehension, a resolved acceptance, and a hearty repose in the love of God. He would understand something of what they meant to express by "obscure faith," "blind elevations of the will," and "mute adherence." He would possibly be able to sympathize with them in their desolations and darkness. He would assuredly be familiar with the interior operation of God in will and affections. And he would doubtless recognize those Divine surprises which enlighten and gladden the uplifted soul. But he would perhaps be offended with some of the terms employed. He would speak less of the native image of God in the soul, and more of the gift of the Holy Spirit. He would accept the mystical formula of renunciation and adherence—"All for all"—but he would deny that anything which belongs to original nature ought to be coerced or nullified. He would dwell more in the illuminated regions of consciousness and penetrate less often to those rayless depths where the dispositions originate and the principles of being are, that "intellectual heaven, where there is no sun nor moon, but God and the Lamb are the light of it." These and other differences he would be careful to mark, but he would be able nevertheless to observe the legitimate experience of his mystical brother: "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man."

DAVID M. McINTYRE.

*PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE TRANSFORMATION
OF EXPERIENCE.*

WHEN the Apostle Paul uttered his calm and yet triumphant certainty, "We know that to them that love God all things work together for good," he was doing something more than making a categorical statement which he had himself accepted, and which he desired his readers to accept, in a spirit of unquestioning faith. He was formulating a principle which he held to be involved, one might say, in the very nature of things, and a principle so essentially reasonable, and so capable of commending its own reasonableness, that he does not pause to enumerate in detail the considerations which make it valid. The statement is not a bare assertion: it is the summing up of an argument which Paul has at the moment no time to draw out in fulness. Its significance is not merely that the Christian men and women to whom Paul was writing were expected to rest in faith amid the trials through which they passed, believing that "all things" would ultimately be proved to have been beneficial in their effects. Its significance is rather this. In so far as the love of God filled their hearts, they would find that love possessed of the power to transform experience—at the time and in the process of its passing—into a source of good. The reasoning behind the assertion—the reasoning implied, though not expressed—is that love is a power which forces all life and experience into the service of its own ideals, and that love, directed upon God, must, therefore, force all life and experience into the service of godliness. And because Paul's utterance is not seldom quoted without full appreciation of its point, it may be worth while to make an attempt at drawing out something of its significance here. It contains the Apostle's definitely conceived doctrine of the transformation of experience for

the Christian man. According to Paul, even those elements of life which the ordinary man satisfies himself with disarming if he can, are for the Christian to be, not only disarmed and robbed of their power to sting and harm and wound, but turned from foes to friends—and this because it is the natural effect of a God-ward love to make all experience a positive contributor of good.

The true spirit, if it dwell in a man, unites all things for him in the ministry of one common purpose. That is the first outstanding idea. The true spirit makes things work together, reduces life to a unity, and whether the incidents that happen be in themselves sweet or sad, compels them to serve one supreme end. That is, of course, to say that the possession of the true spirit solves one of the most pressing problems of life—the problem of making all life a *positive* matter. The desire is universal to find one unifying and constant purpose running through all the range of life: did all its experiences, whatever might be the variety of their shape and the changings of their colour, manifestly assist in the achievement of one great aim, human hearts would be content; and it is precisely because this uniting bond appears to be lacking that restlessness besets the soul. Man is pulled in one direction by one set of circumstances, and dragged in another by the second. What happens to him to-day looks, superficially, almost as if it might have been ordained by a different God from that which happened to him yesterday. One moment brings a message which the next moment contradicts. There is opposition everywhere, and life is a tumult rather than an order: friction and unsettlement and actual conflict on all hands: unity, the thing most desired, is the thing most markedly unattained. The elements of life do not fit in. Life itself is not a positive thing. It is a temporary and painful clambering up the steep, followed by a long backward slide, not a

steady and persistent ascent to the summit of the heights.

Paul's doctrine is that for the true man all this contradiction should have disappeared ; and whatever the immediate experience may be, it should for him be an assistance—and should be recognized as an assistance—in the working out of life's end and aim. For him "all things work together." For him, all the seemingly disunited elements of his living are united by the fact that, whatever they may be in themselves, it is good (in the sense to be presently emphasized) they produce. And Paul would not have had the Christian disciple be content unless he was rising into a consciousness of this definite and positive mastery and lordship over all. Was Christianity to make a man indifferent to what his days might bring ? In a sense, it was to do that, but it was to do more. Was Christianity to make a man strong to endure ? It was, of course, to do that, but only because it did more. It was to make him able to bend all things to life's high purpose : it was to give him some secret charm whereby he could force all things, out of their varied contents, to minister the same richness ; and he was ever to find, under the changing dress that experience might wear, the one unchanging form of good. The disciple was to find all life pulling him one way. The old quarrel between joy and sorrow, success and failure, was to be silenced once for all. A deeper harmony was to be found between things which on the surface looked as if no reconciliation could be. For the disciple, even tribulation and anguish and persecution and famine and sword—death and life and principalities and powers and things present and things to come—Paul's whole catalogue of experiences—were to work together for one great purpose, which they could not but help on.

And the purpose they served was a purpose of "good." That is the next outstanding idea. It is precisely at this point, however, that one needs to put in a plea for a right

understanding of Paul's word. Out of the significance suggested by the word "good" the moral element must on no account be dropped, if Paul's doctrine of the transformation of experience is to be truly apprehended—for, indeed, the moral element is the chiefest thing of all. It is not primarily good in the sense of happiness, but good in the sense of the morally and spiritually good, that all things are to work. If one needs evidence that this interpretation is the interpretation consonant with the Apostle's intention, one can find it, first, in the particular Greek word employed; and next, in the fact that Paul immediately passes on to supply a clear indication of his meaning by speaking about being "conformed to the image of the Son." Of course, Paul would have subscribed with all his heart to the truth that all appearances of evil would be found to be, in the common phrase, "all for the best"; and he spoke in high tones about the trials of the present time not being worthy to be compared with the later glory; but for the moment that side of things is not his concern. We get at the precise meaning of Paul's utterance if we render—"to them that love God all things work together for *goodness*." To them that love God there is a spiritual education in all, and a spiritual profiting to be obtained from all; and the one purpose which life through all its range can be made to serve by those that have the true spirit in them is the purpose of enlarging their hearts' endowment of all that is worthy and noble and true.

The Apostle's statement, therefore, gives no warrant for supposing that pain and sorrow will be, or ought to be, *in themselves*, different things for those that love God, from what they are for other people. The modern mind, searching for the comfort of Paul's doctrine, often understands "good" as if it meant "pleasantness" rather than "worth." Face to face with life, the modern man often says that these

darksome experiences are going to work for his good—that is, he is going to find, now or later, something pleasant come out of them, spite of the unpleasantness which at the moment they bring. They really make for his good—that is, he ought not to feel hurt when these things strike him; and if he could only rise to his privilege, he would find their severity to be only a phantom of his imagination. He does not, of course, formulate in set words any such ideas; but in his heart he carries a vague notion that the Christian disciple ought to find no meaning in the words sorrow and disappointment and bereavement and pain: somehow, through God's manipulation of them for him, their essential character should be transformed. "To them that love God all things work together for pleasantness." Paul's declaration cannot be legitimately so read. It is not with the question of what experience is in itself, but with the question of its final effect upon the disciple, that the Apostle was dealing; and he did not mean that God would conjure with His almighty power and skill upon hardship and sorrow until nothing more than the apparition of them was left to assail the heart that loved. His assurance was, that all things would make a man better—not happier, except in so far as to be better always means to be happier—that all things would make a man better, if in him the true spirit dwelt. It was for spiritual education and development that all life might be made to tell.

The condition on which life might be made to further this one object was that there should be in the heart a God-ward love. That is the third outstanding idea. And here is really the main stress of Paul's doctrine of the transformation of experience—here we come upon the implied argument to which, at the outset, reference was made.

What is the principle involved? How can a love of God, dwelling in a man, force each incident of his experience to

tell towards the spiritual enrichment of character ? What connexion is there between the supposed cause, a God-ward love, and the supposed effect, a power to draw "good" even out of the darker experiences and sadder elements of life ?

The principle is simply this—that the active yearning after good (for the love of God is, of course, the love of good) finds a suggestion and a ministry of good in all that befalls. Him who cares for good, every experience will enrich with good : him who hungers for good, every experience will feed. If affection for good be the dominant characteristic in a man, that affection will nurture and satisfy itself from all that the man goes through.

The legitimacy of the principle cannot be matter of dispute. For it is undoubtedly the case, that in a broad sense life tends to feed and to confirm whatever is the ruling element in a man's character. The effect which the experiences of life produce depends upon that, within the soul, with which they come into contact : there is not a single joy and not a single sorrow which affects two people in precisely the same way : the nature in them takes up the experience as it comes, is worked upon by the experience and itself works upon the experience, and strengthens itself in whatever its dominant quality may have been by the experience as it passes by. The predominantly mean and ignoble man will rise for a moment to sunlit heights of joy, and the joy will only minister to his meanness ; or he will be clasped for a moment in the arms of sorrow, and the sorrow will but fling him out of its embrace presently meaner and more ignoble still ; and all things work together for meanness to him who loves what is mean. The predominantly great-souled man will climb to those same summits of joy and submit himself to the clasp of that same sorrow, and will come down from the mount of delight and emerge from the embrace of grief with a yet more fulfilled greatness in him, with the moral quality

of his being strengthened and confirmed ; and all things work together for greatness to him who loves what is great. In a broad sense, life tends to feed and confirm whatever is the ruling element in the character of him who lives it. And it is on that fact that Paul's doctrine is based. To them that love God—to them that love good—all things work together for good. They meet the sorrow which would narrow and belittle another, and, because care for nobleness is supreme in them, the sorrow works out in nobleness. They are touched, as others are, by the finger of pain, and, though to them pain is pain still, the soul takes no hurt thereby, but, because care for all great qualities is supreme in it, grows the greater for the very pain. If the Apostle's readers desired to find the true unity of life, it needed that they should keep the love of good alive in all its strength, and should keep the heart aspiring towards good with all its power, and should keep the passion for that which is good palpitating through every fibre of their moral being. And then to their predominant love of good, all life, whether for the moment it wore its robes of gladness or its sombre garb of grief, whether it came with gifts in its hand or with a sword to destroy what they had held most dear—to their predominant love of good all life would answer with good. Through the subtle transformation of experience which God-ward love in them would work, life's whole process would be made to yield the good for which they cared the most.

Paul does not stop to commend the sufficiency of his doctrine. He assumes that his readers would find in the doctrine a promise sufficiently inspiring, and would be able to face life unfearing, if through having the love of God in their hearts they could subdue it thus. Certainly to Paul himself, passionately in love with righteousness as he was, such a unity as this that love for good assured left nothing

more to desire. He would have believed, of course, that there was a fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore to come by-and-by, that buried delights would rise from their graves, that all discords would change at last to sweetest music in heaven. But he would have said that all this, in its fulness at any rate, was for those who cared for this truer "good" most and first. It was one of the Apostle's first concerns that man should secure the transformation of experience which God-ward love could perform; and his song of gladness was inspired by the thought that already, in so far as a God-ward love was there, "all things are yours."

HENRY W. CLARK.

"THE JUST SHALL LIVE BY FAITH."

(HAB. II. 4; GAL. III. 11; HEB. X. 38; ROM. I. 17.)

THE principle of development, so fruitful in physics, begins to play a great part also in theology. Already we can see plainly that much was authorized and almost sanctioned in one age, which was promptly denounced when the race had learned enough to profit by its denunciation.

The vine which was brought out of Egypt had to strike its roots and spread its branches far. Messiah had to await the fulness of the times, before the ideas which slowly took form in the Old Testament could become the historic facts of the New.

It is therefore little wonder, when the whole system was developing, advancing, taking newer and deeper meanings undiscerned before, that sometimes a phrase, a text, quoted from the Old Testament in the New, assumes there a depth and richness of significance which the writer little meant. Instead of reckoning as a difficulty this contrast between

the first and the ultimate meaning, we might find it a help, and almost an evidence. Our religion shares with Nature, as being the work of the same God, this germinal quality, this power to unfold and to expand itself. It belongs to many of the greatest sayings in the Old Testament. But this does not mean that we should accept with submission any interpretation, however unreasonable and far-fetched, which a New Testament writer could conceivably impose upon an ancient utterance. It means that what seems arbitrary at the first glance is only an unfolding, if the germ be there.

A fine example of this principle is the saying of Habakkuk, “The just shall live by faith”; and the three quotations of it in the New Testament, each with a slightly specific and distinct shade of meaning.

What did the prophet intend by Faith? Scarcely that which St. Paul meant by it in his citation. Isolated from its context, the Hebrew word scarcely seems to mean “trustfulness” at all, but rather stability—trustworthiness.

To justify the Greek and English rendering (that is to say, the inspired interpretation in the New Testament), we must seek for light from the context. Then we quickly discover that the stability and trustworthiness of the verse is in contrast with the prophet’s own condition, whose soul is profoundly shaken. He has made a passionate appeal to God against the prevalent iniquities. “I cry out unto Thee of violence and Thou wilt not save. Why dost Thou show me iniquity?”

And God has answered that the vengeance upon these iniquities will be surely signal. “I raise up the Chaldeans . . . they are terrible and dreadful . . . they fly as an eagle . . . He scoffeth at kings.” But this scourge of God is a still greater offence to the moral sense than the evils which he comes to punish. “His might is his god . . . Wherefore

lookest thou on them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy peace when the wicked swalloweth up the man that is more righteous than he ? ”

To this conqueror men are as the fishes in a net, and he sacrifices to his net (which is his army) and burns incense to his drag. In other words, the chosen race are abandoned to conquerors who deify brute force. And the prophet cries wildly to the skies—“ Wherefore ? ”

No wonder that a picturesque commentator heads the first chapter “ The Prophet as Sceptic.” Now the reverse of scepticism is Faith. It begins to work when he resolves to stand as on a watch-tower and see what God will answer to his complaint. The reply is so memorable that he is bidden to write the vision on tablets for all to read, since, though it may tarry, it will not really delay.

The answer as concerning the Chaldee is “ his soul is puffed up, it is not level within him,” and therefore, being out of plumb, must sooner or later fall. Not he therefore “ shall live,” but the just shall live through his stability (which the sorely tried prophet needs, and to which he is clearly being exhorted)—through his fidelity amid all that cries out against his faith in a moral rule upon earth. This firmness when the writer had failed, what else is it but a victorious and splendid faith ? And this, said Habakkuk, should preserve him amid the horrors of a fierce invasion. Such temporal protection is plainly what the prophet had in mind. But it is plain also that such deliverance implies the Divine favour : he who thus “ lives,” lives because he is acceptable to God, and his life is given him for a prey.

And now let us see how far the New Testament carries this pronouncement.

St. Paul quotes it first of simple forensic justification, of release from the guilt of past sins. None, he argues, can possibly be justified by the law, for even in the Old Testa-

ment it is written that life, and even the life of a just man is by faith (Gal. iii. 11), and the law is not of faith ; its offer—nay, rather its challenge, which never yet has been accepted with success—is very different ; it says “ The man who doeth these things shall live by them.”

The citation is entirely justifiable ; for it was not written The just shall live by his works, but by the staunchness of a mind stayed upon God.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which though not Paul’s is thoroughly Pauline, the text reappears. But now the question is not of the beginning of life, but of its maintenance. There are teachers of conversion, as if it were the whole of salvation, who forget that the New Testament insists with equal emphasis on both of these. There is a Sacrament of the feeding as well as of the quickening of the soul—and much confusion would be saved by remembering that these are complementary to each other, so that no theory of Sacramental language is satisfactory which cannot be applied to both. That life, we read, is sustained, as it began, by faith. “ The just shall *live* by faith, but if any man draw back (instead of continuing in life), my soul shall have no pleasure in him ” (Heb. x. 38).

Now this citation lies even closer to the original than the first, since Habakkuk wrote of the maintenance of the righteous man among perils, and perils of temporal death. Evidently the man whom God maintained in the day of trouble was abiding in His grace and favour. And this is what the Epistle urges.

St. Paul himself quotes the verse yet again. All true vitality is progressive. The period when the body really ceases to grow—which does not only mean to increase in external bulk—is the period of its beginning to decline ; thenceforward, death worketh in it. The spiritual life also must grow or fall away. And so the Apostle writes, “ The

righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, the just shall live by faith."

Perhaps the best commentary upon this assertion is the Gospel of St. John. Because Jesus said, I saw thee under the fig-tree, Nathanael believed. But presently, when Jesus turned water into wine, Nathanael was among the disciples who believed on Him there. In the same chapter we read that when He was risen from the dead, they remembered—and they believed. Again and again in the interval the same assertion is made. And who fails to understand this? Who does not know that the way of faith is that of a mountain climber, whom each footstep cut with the ice-axe serves but to sustain while cutting another higher footstep, which serves the same purpose in its turn? Every experience of Habakkuk's Israelite during the invasion would advance him "from faith to faith."

From this text, and its use in the New Testament, we see what Scripture means by Faith. It is not the acceptance of even the most precious dogma concerning God or the soul of man. It is the reliance of man upon his living Lord and Friend. It is the same, adding to graces already attained the last grace of the ripest Christian, as at the beginning, purging him from the stain of his old sins.

G. A. DERRY AND RAPHOE.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

PAUL'S epistles will be left over, this month, owing to lack of space. But attention may be drawn to one general point in regard to the New Testament epistles. The epistolary form of address, *ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν*, occurs only twice in the New Testament, viz., in Acts xv. 23 (xxiii. 26) and James i. 1. In the latter case it is linked on to the opening counsel, *πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγγήσασθε*, by a literary device which occurs in two of the Platonic epistles (the third and the eighth). But it is curious to observe that the earliest occurrence of this formula in Greek literature is associated with the term *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*. As Herr G. A. Gerhard points out in the first of a series of studies upon the history of the Greek epistle (*Philologus*, 1905, pp. 27 f.), tradition ascribes the origin of this address to Cleon, who employed it in announcing the news of the victory of Sphacteria in 425 B.C. : *Ἐν ἐπιστολῆς δὲ ἀρχῇ Κλέων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος δημαγωγὸς ἀπὸ Σφακτηρίας πρῶτον χαίρειν προὔθηκεν εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν νίκην τὴν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὴν Σπαρτιατῶν ἄλωσιν* (Lucian, *De lapsu in salutando*, § 3). It was thus an echo of the famous cry, *χαίρετε, νικῶμεν*, which Alcibiades died shouting as he told the news of Marathon. The joy of *χαίρειν* would thus be joy in a triumph, and the news conveyed by the message would be a veritable *εὐαγγέλιον*. Such, at any rate, was the association of the words which Greek tradition loved to preserve. The alternative and more Oriental opening of a letter—*τάδε λέγει*—occurs in Jewish epistles only, so far as Gerhard is aware, in the Apocalypse of Baruch.

The keen controversy over the ascription of the Magnificat to Elizabeth instead of Mary, which agitated many circles in 1902–1904, has been echoing faintly during 1905.

Dr. Bardenhewer's elaborate defence of the canonical text and tradition of the Virgin birth (*Mariä Verkündigung. Ein Kommentar zu Lukas i. 26-28*) synchronizes with an English discussion of the problem between Mr. F. C. Burkitt (pp. cliii.-cliv.) and the Bishop of Salisbury (clv.-clviii.) in Mr. A. E. Burn's volume on *Niceta of Remesiana* (1905), an author who, in his *de Psalmodiæ Bono* (9, 11), assumes that Elizabeth spoke the Magnificat. This, together with the well known occurrence of Elizabeth for Mary in Luke i. 46 in some old Latin MSS. (the reading being also familiar to Origen), will show how widely spread the tradition must have been. Now, as it is extremely difficult to suppose that Elizabeth could have been substituted for Mary, or *vice versâ*, Mr. Burkitt plausibly suggests that the original text ran, *καὶ εἶπεν Μεγαλύνει κτλ.* The bishop agrees that both names are "glosses intended to clear up the sense of a phrase which some readers or scribes found ambiguous," but he inclines (as against critics like Loisy and Völter) to think, on the internal evidence of the context, that it was really Mary who uttered the song, *Μαριάμ* being written in *v.* 56 in order to mark *vv.* 39-56 as a Mary-section.

The origin as well as the meaning of the proverb in Matthew vii. 6 has been a constant puzzle to readers of the Gospel. In a recent number of the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1905, pp. 155 f.), Herr J. Oestrup shows that the idea of pearls as food for animals or birds was not unknown to Oriental folk-lore. In Turkish fairy tales particularly, as well as in Arabian, to fling pearls thus for food was equivalent to extravagant generosity or to something utterly incredible. The author does not pretend to explain how this curious idea penetrated Northern Palestine; but, he adds, it is quite compatible with A. Meyer's conjecture that behind the enigmatic text

lies an original reference to the ring of pearls (סִוְרָק) as a metaphorical term for the Law. The Turkish parallels are noted in G. Jacob's *Türk. Volkslitteratur* (Berlin, 1901, p. 22 note).

The seven deadly sins of the ecclesiastical catalogue (i. pride, ii. avarice, iii. luxury, iv. anger, v. gula, vi. envy, vii. acedia) are anticipated, as has often been pointed out, in the first book of the Epistles of Horace (i. 33 f.), where the poet shows how philosophy has certain remedies or spells for the various fevers of the human soul:—

Fervet avaritia (ii.) miseroque cupidine pectus :
Sunt verba et voces quibus hunc lenire dolorem
Possis et magnam morbi deponere partem.
Laudis amore (i.) tumes : sunt certa piacula quae te
Ter pure lecto poterunt recreare libello.
Invidus (vi.), iracundus (iv.), iners (vii.), vinosus (v.), amator
(iii),
Nemo adeo ferus est ut non mitescere possit,
Si modo culturae patientem commodet aurem.

“Is your breast fevered with avarice and tortured by craving? There are spells and strains whereby you can assuage this pain and rid yourself of much of the malady. Do you swell with a passion for praise? Sure remedies there are for your relief, when purified you have thrice read the precepts. Envious, angry, inert, drunken, licentious—none is so savage that he cannot grow refined, if only he will give heed to culture.” The origin of such a classification, which Horace probably took from Poseidonius, the astrological philosopher, was referred by Reitzenstein to the seven planets. But, in a recent note (*Philologus*, 1905, pp. 21–22), the Russian scholar, Zielinski, proposes to go further and to find in astrological lore the contents as well as the number of the series. He quotes the remark of Servius (on *Aeneid* vi. 714): Mathematici

fungunt, quod . . . cum descendunt animae, trahunt secum torporem Saturni (vii.), Martis iracundiam (iv.), libidinem Veneris (iii.), Mercurii lucri cupiditatem (ii.), Iovis regni desiderium (i.). Two sins, "gula" and envy, are absent from this list. But Zielinski would identify them with the devouring force of the sun and the pale yearning moon, the sun and moon being, here as elsewhere, employed to make up the seven planets.

The far-reaching influence of the sevenfold planetary symbolism is brought out very vividly by Dr. Alfred Jeremias in his monograph upon *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, 1905), containing a full account of the various Oriental speculations which may be held, more or less reasonably, to have entered into the language and ideas of primitive Christianity. The background of symbols, like those of the seven stars, the seven torches, and the seven angels before the throne in the Apocalypse (iv. 5, i. 12, viii. 12, etc.), has long been recognized to be that of the seven planets in Oriental astrology. But Dr. Jeremias shows further how the current association of the planets with various colours has affected the imagery of passages like vi. 1 f. and viii. 6-9. Such mythological and cosmological parallels as are adduced, in researches of this kind, need to be carefully checked, and, in this connexion, reference must be made to the salutary opening remarks of Dr. L. R. Farnell, in his lectures on *The Evolution of Religion* (Crown Theological Library, 1905), about the dangers of mistaking resemblances for proofs of origin or dependence between two religions. Dr. Farnell's special topics are the ritual of purification and the evolution of prayer. But his general prolegomena (pp. 1-87) are of special value, particularly in view of the somewhat rash speculations which disfigure Dr. Otto Pfeiderer's volume in the same series

(*The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, 1905). Dr. Jeremias is at once more sober and original than Pfleiderer. His central thesis may be seen by English readers in the *Hibbert Journal* for October (pp. 217 f.). But the untranslated German essay is a mine of wealth for the cautious critic of the New Testament. Mammon, e.g., he identifies (pp. 95-96) with the Babylonian man-man, a surname of Nergal, the god of the underworld. And Babylonian parallels of great interest and appositeness are brought forward to illustrate verses like Matthew x. 35 (pp. 97 f., where family divisions are shown to have been a characteristic of the new era in Babylonian eschatology), Acts xii. 15 (pp. 112 f., the guardian angel), and Apocalypse xii. (pp. 42 f., where the author is careful to add that "the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead has no analogy in the history of religion").

One of Dr. Jeremias' notes is on the expression, *baptism in the name of God* (Matt. xxviii. 19, etc.), which he interprets, on Eastern analogies, to mean incorporation into the glory of God. As the "name" is equivalent (cf. Phil. ii. 9) to the victorious power of Jesus, triumphing over death, baptism into His name implies a share in His divine authority and glory (pp. 104-106). On different lines Dr. F. H. Chase (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1905, pp. 481-521), in the course of an elaborate refutation of Mr. Conybeare's hypothesis, while admitting with Riggenbach the possibility that ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου in the Western text of Matthew xxviii. 19 may be a harmonizing gloss from Luke xxiv. 47, contends that the command to baptize means immersion or incorporation into the divine Name. Jesus, he argues, is not prescribing the use of a formula. He is unfolding the spiritual content of a rite which was already used by His disciples (John iv. 1 f.).

Both Dr. Chase and Professor Goodspeed (*American Journal of Theology*, July 1905) agree that the substance of the lost ending of Mark's Gospel is to be found in Matthew xxviii. 9 f., but the latter scholar rejects the incident of vv. 11-15 as unauthentic. Wellhausen, like J. Weiss, objects to this interpretation. He conceives xvi. 8 to have been the natural ending of Mark's Gospel, and pronounces any opinion to the contrary to be based on a misreading of xvi. 4. Of that verse his own interpretation is as follows: " 'The stone was rolled back; for it was very large.' This tells us everything. For it was rolled back by the Risen One, as He broke through the closed door. This visible effect is the only evidence which Mark offers of the resurrection; he does not make the least effort to give a graphic sketch of what nobody saw." This is expanded in the rather unsatisfactory closing section of the short, incisive *Introduction to the First Three Gospels* (Berlin, 1905), with which he has followed up his editions of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. "The very evident reluctance of the earliest Gospel to make Jesus speak of His own advent by no means proves that the faith in that advent was not firmly fixed in the church by this time. Only," he adds, "it seems to me probable that the resurrection or ascension of Jesus was not from the first taken as a mere earnest, nor supplemented originally by His advent, but rather that people were content at the outset with the general advent, i.e., the advent of the kingdom of God" (pp. 97-98). Dr. Arnold Meyer's treatise, *die Auferstehung Christi* (1905), discusses this and the other cognate questions in an exhaustive manner, approximating to the general line taken by Schmiedel, but dealing more adequately, if not successfully, with the wider problems of the resurrection. Wellhausen's editions have elicited at least two excellent notices, one by Jülicher in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for November,

the other by Professor Allan Menzies in his *Review of Theology and Philosophy* for August and September.

The Book of Acts has not received much notice lately, as a whole, but Dr. Carl Clemen's lectures on *die Apostelgeschichte im Lichte der neueren text-, quellen- und historisch-kritischen Forschungen* (1905) serve as a convenient register of contemporary opinion, and present in succinct form the author's own conclusions on the book. Like most recent critics, he sets aside Blass's well-known theory of the two recensions of the text, doubting if even at xii. 10, xix. 9, xx. 15 and xxi. 1 the B-text, with its peculiar readings, is superior. Dr. Clemen undervalues, I think, the extent and weight of the "medical" element in the third Gospel and Acts (pp. 26 f.), which is more serious and continuous than he seems to realize, but he inclines to believe that Luke wrote the we-journal. Simultaneously with his monograph, a large, well illustrated treatise on Paul's voyage to Rome has been published by a former sea-captain, Hans Balmer (*die Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus und die Seefahrtskunde im römischen Kaiserzeitalter*, 1905), who follows Weizsäcker in general, gives a sketch of Paul's career, defends the historicity of the account of the voyage in Acts, and incidentally upholds with vigour the claim of Malta to be the island in which the Apostle was shipwrecked. He contends that Luke must have meant to write a sequel to Acts (p. 493); whether it was ever composed or not we cannot tell.

Weizsäcker's treatise on the apostolic age has now been followed up by a similar monograph on the sub-apostolic age: *das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (1905). Rudolf Knopf, the author of this fluent, careful study, works mainly along Harnack's lines. He, like Weizsäcker, abjures footnotes and literary references, and is content to present the history

of the Christian communities from the Flavian dynasty to Hadrian in a series of admirable sketches, which have the great merit of giving a survey of the general current without undue absorption in details.

In the tenth volume (pp. 390-396) of the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, issued this year, Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, President of the Hebrew Union College in Ohio, writes the article upon the Book of Revelation, which he regards as the Christian embodiment and edition of two Jewish apocalypses. The first of these is to be traced in i. 1, 8, 12-19, iv.-vi. 17, viii. 1-13, ix., xi. 14 f., with the exception of passages like those referring to the Lamb (v. 9-14, vii. 9-10, etc.). This apocalypse the writer ascribes to a period of persecution before the destruction of Jerusalem, "when many Jews died as martyrs, though some yielded; hence only 12,000 of each tribe are to be selected." The "hence" is not very obvious. To this source, it is possible, Dr. Kohler thinks, that even xiv. 1-5, 6-7, and xi. 16-18, 19 originally belonged. As for the rest of the Apocalypse, i.e. x. 2-xi. 13, xii. 1-xiii. 18, xiv. 6-xxii. 6, this represents a second Jewish source, written in Hebrew during the siege and after the destruction of Jerusalem, though xiii. 11-17, xvi. 8-11, etc., are Christian interpolations. These two Apocalypses Dr. Kohler opines must have been, like that in Matthew xxiv. and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the possession of Essenes, who joined the Jewish-Christian Church after the destruction of the Temple (cf. xxi. 22). The seer of Patmos he regards as John the Presbyter. Apart from this contribution to the Apocalypse, the outstanding feature of the year's output in this line has been, of course, the publication, in book form, of Professor Ramsay's studies on *The Seven Letters* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1905), containing a wealth of material for the student of the book in general.

Indirectly the question of the authorship of Revelation has emerged in connexion with the discussion of another New Testament problem, viz., that of the Johannine tradition. In the dialogue between Jesus and the two sons of Zebedee (Mark x. 38 f.), the words, "Ye shall drink the cup that I drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized," have been held by some scholars to imply that both John and James suffered martyrdom. The patristic support for this view, which is not strong, was presented by Dr. Schmiedel in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (2509–2510), adversely discussed by Dr. James Drummond in his exhaustive work on the Fourth Gospel (p. 228), and Dr. V. H. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historic Documents*, i. pp. 166 f.), and more favourably viewed by Mr. Badham in the *American Journal of Theology* (1904, pp. 539 f.). Wellhausen's recent adherence to this interpretation of this synoptic passage, however, has started fresh interest in the theory, and an elaborate, if somewhat multifarious, essay is now published by Dr. Schwartz (*über den Tod der Söhne Zebedæi*) in the Proceedings of the Royal Scientific Society of Göttingen. To this, reference must be made again. Meantime, it must be enough to say that as Dr. Schwartz assumes the martyrdom of the two disciples was simultaneous, he is led into a number of forced answers and arbitrary constructions of history, not the least of which is an attempt to show that the John of Acts xv. = Galatians ii. was not the son of Zebedee.

The whole problem is discussed not only by von Soden in his fresh little *Urchristliche Literatur* (1905), pp. 213 f., which is now translated into English, but in the *Theologische Rundschau* (1905), by Professor Bousset, who adhere strongly to the hypothesis of a Jerusalemite disciple, and attempts to explain the origin of the later Johannine tradition

by means of a confusion between the great John of Asia Minor, who was not an apostle, and the apostle of the same name who had suffered martyrdom much earlier. Hilgenfeld's animadversions on this view, in his own journal (*Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1905), insist that if the author of the Fourth Gospel wrote only a few years after the death of John of Asia Minor, it is hardly possible that he should have blended and confused that figure with the Apostle John. In the course of his argument he takes occasion to recall his former very curious explanation of the number 153 in John xxi. 11. It is a cryptic allusion, he alleges, to Nathanael (*v.* 2), "in whom I have found the apostolus suffectus, Matthias." There are three disciples to whom the Risen Jesus in the Fourth Gospel reveals Himself : (i.) Peter, (ii.) Thomas, and (iii.) Nathanael. (i.) John xx. 19-23 (*a*), (ii.) xx. 26-29 (*β*), (iii.) xxi. *NAΘANAHA T̄=153.*

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE SCRIBES OF THE NAZARENES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE general title, Scribes of the Nazarenes, indicates the scope of the present series of Essays in New Testament Exegesis. They illustrate a particular line of defence in support of the general proposition that the Apostolic writings as commonly received are genuine products of the age to which they are traditionally assigned.

So long as Christianity remained anywhere and in any sense a sect of Judaism, its missionaries were first disciples of Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth,¹ and after Scribes of the Nazarenes. As such, they expounded the Law and the Prophets alongside, and with the help of, the tradition, which they had received from their Master. Like the Scribes of the Pharisees they annulled the former in order to establish the latter.

The records, then, of the School of Jesus, being authentic, will present internal evidence of their authenticity. The Rabbi of Nazareth will be represented as employing Jewish methods of argument and instruction ; and His followers as mainly concerned with the preservation and application of His teaching. These features are often conspicuous not only in the Gospels, but also in the Epistles and the speeches of Acts. But often also they have become obscured and even obliterated. The description of the occasion and the genesis of many of Jesus' sayings has been discarded as unnecessary for the practical purposes of edification. Much of this material, which would have

¹ Apart from all other evidence for this contemporary view of our Lord, *Disciples* is a correlative term and implies a Rabbi.

been invaluable to the historian and to the apologist, has been lost past hope of recovery. But in some cases it is possible to suggest, with some show of reason, attendant circumstances and a background which fit an isolated utterance. And in some cases of difference between two reports of the same words the tacit challenge to test the divergent authorities may be accepted: an explanation may be found which shall establish the authenticity of the one and use the other as an illustration of the development of Christianity.

The writings of the Scribes, which are not professedly records of our Lord's words and works, are a valuable aid to the determination and authentication of the teaching of Jesus. In the occasional epistles addressed to Gentiles even St. Paul builds upon the common tradition.

That such inquiry must be made needs no demonstration. On the one hand there are those who profess an unflinching faith in each saying or version of a saying as it comes up for discussion. On the other hand there are those who with unwavering incredulity assign the bulk of the Evangelic sayings to certain Paulinist or Jewish Christians (as the case may require) who lived towards the end of the first century A.D.—in Utopia. It is indeed possible that *the commandments of others* have been combined with those *proceeding from the truth itself* by compilers less careful than Papias: traces of the process are to be found in the writings of the most esteemed Fathers of the Church. But the thesis that of the Sayings contained in both the great sources which underlie the Synoptic Gospels, to say nothing of other records, all but nine are spurious¹ implies a triumph of

¹ *Enc. Biblica*, Gospels, §§ 139 f. The writer of the article (Professor Schmiedel) deprecates the obvious inference that the passages "have been sought out with partial intent as proofs of the human as against the divine character of Jesus . . ." "In reality (he says) they prove not only that in the person of Jesus we have to do with a completely human being, and

imagination over matters of fact so impressive that the instinctive protest dies on one's lips.

One is hypnotized by the restless subtlety of the critic who uses one saying to disprove the other and ends by discarding both. But when only nine sayings are left to form the fabric of a truly scientific life of Jesus one feels that too many stones have been rejected along with the chief corner-stone which binds the rest—*ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς*. The critic has become the Aristophanes of his own theories, and one is irresistibly impelled to echo the comment of the slave in the comedy *and then I woke and it was all a dream*. Yet even the nightmare, in which one watched with powerless fascination the demolition of familiar landmarks, is not without its uses. The moral is clear enough: a reason must be forthcoming for the faith that Jesus of Nazareth spoke thus and thus. Wanting a theory true to the facts of psychology and history, those who rely upon the extant Gospels as inerrant are exposed to such taunts as were uttered by the neophyte philosopher.

By Zeus in heaven, d'ye say? What ignorance!
 A man of your age to believe in Zeus! . . .
 You're still a baby with your old-world notions . . .
 I'll tell you something that will make you man.¹

And their disciples, if not they themselves, are in danger of yielding by habit to the imminent authority so as to say in their own way—

The point had escaped me
 That Zeus was not but in his place, Vortex now lord of creation.²

It is not merely "sacred" history which is written for our

that the divine is to be sought in him only in the form in which it is capable of being found in a man; they also prove that he really did exist and that the Gospels contain at least some absolutely trustworthy facts concerning him."

¹ Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 818 ff. (English version by A. D. Godley and C. Bailey).

² *Ibid.* 380 f.

instruction, who inherit the revenues of the ages. There are current and fashionable methods of Christian apologetic which did good service in the cause of Greek paganism, and yet could not arrest its inevitable decay. It was not for want of wisdom that the writer of the *de Mysteriis* is adjudged to have failed where Origen or his better successors succeeded. Truth will prevail despite its advocates when they adopt or resuscitate the arm of the flesh, and so appeal deliberately to the weakness of human nature. But its triumph does not endorse the validity of their methods of defence. The truth of Christianity is ancient history in a sense, although it remains ever new and fresh.

But Christianity is still a religion which rests on an historical foundation. If the facts recited in the simplest form of its early creed be false, the evidence of experience, individual or collective, is naught. *If Christ hath not been raised*, St. Paul said, *then after all our preaching is empty—empty is your faith ; moreover we are found to be false witnesses for God because we bare witness against God that he raised the Messiah.*¹

It is not indeed of such vital importance to establish the accuracy of the traditional ascription of the words of Jesus. The life is more than meat, though the meat be words which proceeded from the mouth of God. But the present distress calls for honest attempts to “diminish into clearness” the Oracles of the Lord. It is not enough to extract truth for all time from the alleged sayings of Jesus without first proving them to be truth’s vessels appropriate to their own age.

By way of preface to a sketch of the extant records of the Teaching of Jesus two cases may be adduced of sayings denuded of their context or altered in transmission, both of which have some connexion with the title.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 14.

The first is commonly regarded as typically universalist in tone. *Come unto me, all ye that are weary and burdened, and I will refresh you. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls: for my yoke is easy and my burden is light.*¹ One is accustomed to regard this utterance with reverent thankfulness: "Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith to all that truly turn unto Him." But at present it is necessary to inquire if they can conceivably have been spoken by Jesus of Nazareth, the Jewish Teacher, to the Jews, who were vaguely attracted by His parables and His miracles. It was indeed a true instinct which led some teacher to isolate this expression of the essence of Christianity; but, now that there is none to say "I heard," this pearl of price has no setting to save it. Nevertheless the saying can justify itself to the critical historian of the letter as apart from the spirit. First it was spoken in Aramaic as it contains an Aramaic play on words (*rest* and *meek*) which is lost in the Greek translation.² Secondly, the citation *ye shall find rest for your souls* follows the original Hebrew, and not the Septuagint.³ Thirdly, the words *meek* and *lowly* belonged to the Pharisees in their Golden Age; so that the speaker thus represents himself as a heart-Pharisee—a Pharisee indeed.⁴ Next, the *yoke* and the *burden* belong to the Scribe, who offers a *light* and *easy* service, which is freedom compared with the *intolerable burdens* which some Scribes imposed upon their law-abiding disciples.⁵ Lastly,

¹ Matt. vi. 28-30.

² The Peshitta gives it וְאֵנָּה אֲנִי חַבּוּן . . . דְּנִיחַ אֲנִי.

³ Jer. vi. 16, εὐρήσετε ἀγασμὸν (כורגול) ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.

⁴ So the Alexandrian author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Jesus as ideal Pharisee as well as High Priest: "For such an high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, *separated from sinners* . . ." (vii. 26).

⁵ "Rabbi Nechonyiah ben ha-Qanah said, 'Whoso receives upon him the yoke of Torah, they remove from him the yoke of royalty and the yoke of worldly care'" (Pirque Aboth, iii. 8).

the whole invitation, considered formally, is framed after the model of that of the Sage: *Draw nigh unto me. Put your neck beneath the yoke, and let your soul receive instruction. It is near to find her. Behold with your eyes that I laboured little and found me much rest.*¹ But Jesus said, *I will give you rest*, identifying Himself with Wisdom. Thus He summoned disciples to learn from Him, the true Sage and Scribe and Pharisee, learned in Scripture, and yet speaking so as to win the people.

It is right that all who turn to Christ should believe that this saying is addressed to them. It is expedient that they should also be able to show cause for their belief and remember how their right was won. They who of the Gentiles have believed on the Messiah obtained this freedom at a great price, whereas they whom Jesus addressed were freeborn. The Evangelist, who first reported the naked saying without its environment, has co-operated with successive generations of believers to emphasize its latent and potential universality.

And if any are inclined to regard St. Paul as the rock on which the Church Catholic was built to the exclusion of St. Peter, it may be suggested that St. Peter first enunciated the general interpretation of this particular saying. The familiarity of Jesus' intercourse with the Twelve was responsible for the slowness as for the sureness of their understanding, and the quick insight of St. Paul, which had no such impediment, dwarfed unduly their gradual enlightenment for the historian of early Christianity. But even in the abbreviated narrative of the Council of Jerusalem preserved in Acts,² it is clear that St. Peter had experienced the fulfilment of the promise, *When he come, the Spirit of the Truth shall guide you into all truth . . . he shall glorify*

¹ Ecclus. li. 23 ff. The text is doubtful.

² xv. 6 ff.

me, because he shall take of mine and declare it unto you. And the writer does not minimize although he does not emphasize the fact, that the conversion of St. Peter was the beginning of victory for the free Gospel. After St. Peter had spoken, the whole assembly *became silent and began to listen to Paul and Barnabas.* The speech which won the day was based on this saying interpreted in the light of the speaker's experience: *Brethren, ye know that from olden days among you God made choice that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe; and the heart-searching God bare testimony to them—gave them the Holy Spirit as to us—and made no distinction between us and them—cleansed their hearts by the faith. Therefore, this being so, why tempt ye God? why attempt to set a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we could bear? Nay, by the grace of the Lord Jesus we have faith to be saved even as they.* Himself said, "Hither, ye burdened ones . . . My burden is light."

The second illustration of the view taken of Jesus and His disciples in the title leads also to a consideration of the necessary discrimination between the sources which lie behind the four Gospels. Its appropriateness is not obvious in St. Luke's version: *Therefore the Wisdom of God said, I will send to them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will kill and persecute out.* But in the First Gospel it reads: *Therefore behold I send unto you prophets and sages and scribes: some ye will kill and crucify, and some ye will scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city.* Before venturing to decide which version is to be preferred we may conveniently examine the setting given to the saying by St. Luke, whose Gospel professes itself an orderly digest of various partial traditions, reputed to rest upon apostolic authority.

St. Luke then represents the discourse of which this

saying is part as having been delivered by Jesus as guest of an unnamed Pharisee. It is noteworthy that he alone of the Evangelists mentions three such occasions in all.¹ Such intercourse had a peculiar interest for the companion of St. Paul, who had been a Pharisee according to the human standard, and was God's Pharisee²; it was also liable to be first ignored and then forgotten by the generality of the Christian sect, as it drifted apart from Judaism. But at the outset, before Jesus had Himself everywhere violated the fundamental principles of the Law and the Pharisaic tradition, there is every reason to suppose that his demand for national repentance, in view of the instant realization of the Messianic hope, elicited a certain sympathy from the worthy representatives of the Pious of old.

The first of these incidents has some affinity with that recorded by St. Mark³ and St. Matthew⁴ as having taken place in the house of Simon the leper. It may be that certain details have been interpolated thence in St. Luke's account—or in his source—through the influence of early attempts at harmonization. Further, it seems possible that St. John⁵ wished to substitute the true version of the anointing of Jesus by a woman for a current distortion of the facts: he does not specify the host, and for him the Pharisees are for the most part merged in *the Jews*, who appear as the determined enemies of Jesus. But there seems to be no valid reason for refusing credit to St. Luke's narrative as a distinct episode, whichever be the true version of the Anointing. To wash the feet of her Saviour with tears, to dry them with her hair, and to kiss them would be the natural expression of the gratitude of such lost ones, whom Jesus sought and found.

¹ xi. 37, vii. 36, xiv. 1.

² Rom. i. 1: *separated unto the Gospel of God*: the Greek word preserves at least the consonants of the original.

³ Mark xiv. 3-9.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 6-13.

⁵ John xii. 2-8.

The second is represented as the occasion of the denunciation of the Pharisees generally, which better befits the third, when it is said : *And it came to pass, when he entered into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on Sabbath to eat bread, and they were watching Him.*¹ Certainly there is no ground for imputing guile to the author, or to the reporter, of the second invitation. The Pharisee had apparently listened to the denunciation of this generation, which is appended both by St. Matthew and St. Luke to the Marcan narrative² of the charge *in Bezebul . . . he casteth out the devils*. Since it is the morning meal to which Jesus is invited, it seems more natural to regard the words *Now as the crowds were assembling he began to say* as marking the beginning not merely of a fresh source but also of the narrative to which the invitation belongs. If, however, the arrangement adopted by St. Luke and St. Matthew be held to be based on exact knowledge, the episode begins with the charge brought against Jesus by *certain scribes sent from Jerusalem*, and thus belongs to the early part of the Galilean ministry after one visit at least to Jerusalem. In either case the action of the Pharisee is quite intelligible. He may have witnessed the expulsion of the dumb devil; and the discomfiture of the learned doctors from the capital would not diminish his respectful sympathy with a fellow-provincial, who was also a Rabbi powerful in word and deed. At any rate the speech addressed to the gathering crowds—the phrase seems to suit the beginning of a new day—contained nothing to affront and much to attract one who separated himself from the vulgar in order to practise the Levitical law. Jesus had denounced *this generation* generally, and the Pharisee naturally applied His words to the People of the Earth—*this crowd that knoweth not the law are accursed.*³ Moreover, He

¹ Luke xiv. 1, 2 ff. *The Ruler* suggests Jerusalem. Compare *Jesus answered and said unto the lawyers and Pharisees* with xi. 45 ff.

² Mark iii. 22; cf. John viii. 48. ³ John vii. 49.

displayed an apt knowledge of Scripture, of which He made effective use, and He excited not merely the admiration but also the curiosity of His hearer : *so shall the Son of Man be to this generation . . . behold more than Solomon . . . more than Jonah is here.* If He referred to Himself as Sage and preacher of repentance, surely His language was somewhat boastful. But what of *the Son of Man* ? Was this brother Pharisee proclaiming the advent of the Messiah, who was depicted in the Psalms of the Pharisees as *more than Solomon*, and was designated in the Pharisaic Similitudes of the book of Enoch by the mysterious title derived from Daniel ?

If such were the feelings which prompted the invitation, the surprise with which he saw his honoured Guest neglect one prominent rule of the Pharisaic tradition was perfectly natural. Jesus, fresh from addressing the crowds, if not also from healing the demoniac, failed to cleanse His person from the inevitable pollution of such intercourse.

At this point the narrative breaks off : the Evangelist passes straight to a report of Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees in general. The host and scene fade out of sight ; the interpellation of a Lawyer directs the wrath of Jesus to the Lawyers ; and, finally, the second speech concludes, joined only by a meagre and artificial link to its beginning : *and when he went forth thence began the Scribes and the Pharisees. . . .* The connexion of the *woes* pronounced upon the Pharisees and the Lawyers, with its setting, is clearly due to the editor¹ : the arrangement of the same material, adopted in the First Gospel, as part of the solemn farewell to Jerusalem and the temple seems much more likely to be true to the fact.

It remains to examine the divergences between St.

¹ The Western text perceived the inappropriateness of the occasion and altered the discrepant designation *scribes* (53). *Lawyer* is distinctive of a tradition intended for non-Jews.

Matthew and St. Luke in respect of the text of the saying :

MATT. XXIII. 34.

διὰ τοῦτο
 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ
 ἀποστέλλω
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς
 προφήτας καὶ
 σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς

LUKE XI. 49.

διὰ τοῦτο καὶ
 ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν·
 ἀποστελῶ
 εἰς αὐτοὺς
 προφήτας καὶ
 ἀποστόλους

In the first place *Apostles* is the usual technical term appropriated to Christian teachers and especially to the envoys directly appointed by Jesus. Controversies about the necessary qualifications of an apostle fixed the word upon the memory of the early Church.¹ If regard be had to the proclivities of the Christian scribe no less than to the ignorance of such as Theophilus, the conclusion is immediate and certain : *sages and scribes* were changed to *apostles* as the proper complement to Prophets in this description of God's dealings with men. St. Luke could not for obvious reasons continue to use his word *Lawyer*, which served above as the more intelligible synonym of *Scribe* ; and to a Paulinist the word *sages* was as obnoxious as *Lawyer*, if applied to Christian teachers. Apostles are Legalists and Sages, just as they are Pharisees, in the highest sense, which was never realized before. St. Paul, who was so easily made out to be lawless, protests that he is not *God's outlaw, but Christ's inlaw* ; and, after deriding the sage and his wisdom as comparable to the magicians of Pharaoh, he claims, *we speak God's wisdom*. But to have introduced the qualification necessary in view of these controversies into the written text would have been illegitimate and at the same time intolerably clumsy.

Scribes and sages, then, become *apostles*, and the saying by way of compensation is ascribed to the *Wisdom of God*. Now if it be a saying of Jesus, St. Paul's words, *Christ God's Power and God's Wisdom*,² are enough to warrant the

¹ Apoc. ii. 2 ; 1 Cor. ix. 1 f.

² Cor. ix. 21 ; 1 Cor. i. 20–ii. 9.

substitution of *the Wisdom of God* for *I*. But it is by no means certain that St. Matthew did not regard the words as, in part at any rate, a quotation from Scripture. *Therefore* is a not uncommon abbreviation of *it stands written*. And so in respect of St. Luke's formula it is not improbable that among the Sages the whole of the Law and the Prophets was regarded as the utterance of that Wisdom of God which deigned to take up her abode in Israel. The Old Testament has been known by various names at different times, and, speaking generally, by the name which belongs properly to the part regarded from time to time as the most important.

This supposition, that the saying is really a current expansion of familiar Scripture, removes many difficulties. For if Jesus spoke thus in His own person, we must have recourse to St. Peter to justify the statement that He sent and inspired the prophets,¹ or summarily transfer the whole reference to the messengers of the New Covenant. It may be thought that St. Luke supports the latter view with his version *prophets and apostles*. But when the Christian prophets are in question they always occupy the second place: the Apostles came first.² Even so, St. Luke's version may not claim superior originality: *proclivi lectioni praestat ardua*.

But if Jesus is quoting a summary of God's dealings with His people, which contemplates only in an aside the period between the close of the Old Testament history and His own times, the saying seems to have some bearing on the Parable of the Husbandmen. It may be its Scriptural foundation or part of its interpretation—part only, because it does not cover the final tragedy. In this case it is an example of the practice of Jesus from which St. Paul deduced his theory

¹ 1 Peter i. 11.

² 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11; Apoc. xviii. 20.

that *Scripture was written for our learning*. The context supports this view and points to the source of the embryo thought. The period contemplated is defined exactly *from the blood of Abel the righteous to the blood of Zechariah*. The speaker does not notice the atrocities which were¹ inflicted on the righteous after the record of the Old Testament Canon came to an end. Further, his chronology was based upon the current arrangement of the books. The Canon ended with the books of Chronicles ; therefore, for his purpose, the history ended with the last pertinent evidence recorded there. Origen's suggestion that the reference is to the murder of the father of John Baptist is based on an aetiological myth. Palestinian Jews seem to have ignored the period during which no prophet appeared in Israel : the prosperity of the Hasmonaeans eclipsed and stultified their earlier zeal for the religion of Jehovah.

Jesus, then, the Rabbi of Nazareth, adopted the horizon of His colleagues without ignoring the value of the teaching of the Sages and the Scribes. He said in effect : "The succession of prophets had failed, but the followers of Solomon and of Ezra had filled their place : they also were Apostles of Jehovah. All met their doom at the hands of the rulers of Israel. Thus it stands written in Scripture, YET HE SENT PROPHETS TO THEM *to bring them again unto the Lord, and they resisted against them, but they would not give ear. And the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada the priest, which stood above the people, and said unto them, Thus saith God, Why transgress ye the commandments of the Lord that ye cannot prosper ? because ye have forsaken the Lord he hath also forsaken you. And they conspired against him and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king (Joash) in the court of the house of the Lord.*"²

¹ Matt. xxiii. 35=Luke xi. 51.

² 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 ff.

The Jews of the first century A.D. regarded the period of Hasmonaeans and of Herod as the Dark Ages: few had insight enough to see that the Sages, like the Scribes, sat of right on Moses' seat. Beyond that the Prophets dominated the imagination of the historian. The saying adopted by Jesus occurs again at the end of the book of Chronicles: *And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes and sending: because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place: but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets.*¹ It is also the recurring refrain in the prophecies of Jeremiah, who at one time enjoyed the primacy of the prophets²: *And the Lord hath sent you all his servants the prophets, rising early and sending them. . . . Because they have not hearkened to my words, saith the Lord, which I sent unto them by my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending them, but ye would not hear.*³

Over and over it is written, therefore, that Jehovah has sent, sends, and will send prophets to His people, who pay no heed. Some Scribe added the gloss—He sends also the sages and even scribes. And Jesus endorsed the expansion and built a parable thereon, which went further still. The summary history of God's embassies to men is also a summary prophecy. God has sent, and will send, His messengers. Even if the renovation of all things beginning with the departure of the Messiah, which is also His Advent, contain a repetition at the first of men's hardness of heart and contempt of God's word and commandment, the elect who have seen and believed are present in the midst of the unbelieving world and will leaven the lump. Now, as not before, the national apostasy was turned to good purpose.

¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15 f.

² 2 Macc. ii. 1-8; cf. xv. 14 ff.

³ Jer. xxv. 4, xxix. 19; cf. vii. 25, xxvi. 5, xxxv. 15, xlv. 4.

Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. . . . Through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. . . . If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? ¹

God sent Prophets, Sages, Scribes, to help His people to the understanding of His Law. Last of all he sent His Son. Each of His messengers in turn had cause to adopt the prophet's verdict upon his mission. *Who hath believed our report?* Already, when the Son appeared, the Sages and the Scribes were overshadowed by the elder dignity of the Prophets. Only Scribes remained, and they laid no claim to direct inspiration. God had spoken to His people partially and in diverse manners: at last He spake in His Son, who appeared among men as Prophet, Sage and Scribe. *He came to His home and His home-folk received Him not.² But some accepted Him; and to them He gave power to become God's sons,* to the elect within and without the elect people. They that were without the ancient Covenants were soon more than those who were within: they had Sages of their own and to them the name and function of Scribes was unknown. They were ready to forget those aspects of their Master, which they could not understand or saw depreciated by odious comparisons. Even in His life on earth it was the doctors of Jerusalem who could best appreciate Him as Sage and Scribe. His claim to be Prophet, on the other hand, was intelligible to an audience wider even than that to which He appealed in Galilee. On this claim, then, the Evangelists insist: of this in its narrowest sense they adduce the most impressive proof. Jesus the Prophet, who was *not without honour save in His own country*, in speaking

¹ Rom. xi. 5, 11 f.

² John i. 11.

of the end of the world foretold the destruction of the Holy City, which came to pass.

But the Sages and the Scribes had also served God in their generation ; and the Scribes were in possession. God had come to be regarded as the Great Rabbi ; His Son, therefore, came as His Scholar, teaching in His name. The Sages were forgotten ; not even tombs were built for them.¹ *Scribe* was and is a term of abuse in the Christian vocabulary. But in the beginning it was not so. John Baptist might boast himself to be the incarnation of a Divine Voice—a Bath Qol—and nothing more : the faithful prophet, for whose coming the people had longed in vain, sat among the doctors of Jerusalem hearing them and asking them questions. From their amazement He won the reluctant admission that He possessed the Scribe's equipment, though He had not passed through the Scribe's apprenticeship. *Jesus went up into the temple and taught. And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters having never learned ? Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.*² The written word of the Lord was precious in those days, when for so long there had been no open vision. The Prophet must be Scribe also, must offer a *yoke* and a *burden*, and must instruct those who accepted the invitation.

The new Economy was the counterpart of the old. As the Father sent the Son at last, even so the Son in His turn sent Prophets, Sages, Scribes. The succession of Prophets began anew ; the Spirit was given when Jesus was glorified. Sages sprang up to speak God's wisdom stripped of the swaddling clothes of nationalist ideals and modes of

¹ Rightly or wrongly they were regarded as agents of Hellenism, which first Antiochus Epiphanes, then the triumphant Maccabaeans, lastly Herod, failed to commend to the Jews.

² John vii. 14-16.

thought. Scribes were ready to hand on the Tradition which was as directly the commandment of God as the Scriptures which they expounded ; and to them it was said, *Be not called Rabbi, for one is your Teacher . . . nor be called Directors for your Director is one, the Messiah.*

J. H. A. HART.

THE CROSS IN RELATION TO SIN : CAN A MORAL THEORY LEAVE THIS OUT ?

THE question of the relation of the Cross of Christ to man's sin and to the Gospel of the Divine forgiveness is raised afresh by the very comprehensive discussions of Dr. Stevens in his recently published Work on *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*. After much consideration of all theological theories and of the Scriptural teaching on the subject, Dr. Stevens decisively adopts what he terms the "moral theory" of the Cross as distinguished not only from all those described as "penal" and "ethical satisfaction" theories, but also from any such conception of the relation of the Cross to sin as is implied in, for example, St. Paul's teaching in the first half of the Epistle to the Romans. We have no intention of attempting a criticism of Dr. Stevens' very suggestive volume : others no doubt will do this. We have a very full sympathy with Dr. Stevens in his desire to remove the misconceptions that have often gathered around the Cross and the character of God and to present a doctrine of salvation that shall be in line with the whole teaching and work of Christ and with His revelation of God. But we feel compelled to ask, whether a moral theory of the Cross, if it is to be complete, must not take up into itself, in some form, that element which is at the basis of the rejected theories—an element which, in whatever way some of its theological statements may be judged, has certainly been the nerve of

that which we commonly understand as "evangelical Christianity," viz., that the sufferings and death of Christ had a direct relation to human sin and to the Gospel of Divine forgiveness ; that, in some real sense, Christ " bore our sins," not merely by sympathy but by suffering and death ; and that this was necessary in view of the Divine grace of forgiveness which, through the Cross of Christ, comes to us with saving power. The moral theory is defined by Dr. Stevens as that which " attempts to construe the work of Christ as an actual saving power directly operating upon human life, and, accordingly, to interpret His death, primarily, as a factor in his influence upon the moral life of the world." So far as this goes, no one will refuse assent. All theologians will describe their theories as moral in this sense. Any theory that is not one of moral influence is at once ruled out for that very reason. But the above definition is meant to exclude that special conception of the death of Christ in relation to sin to which we have referred, and we venture to think that apart from its inclusion the theory is sadly incomplete as a moral theory.

We shall here deal with the subject quite broadly, without raising any of the questions of exegesis or interpretation that might well be raised. The Cross stood as a great and unexpected fact for the interpretation of the first disciples under the guidance or stimulus of the Holy Spirit. All the Apostles were men of Jewish birth and training, and it was inevitable that they should apprehend and interpret the significance of the Cross in the terms that were familiar to them. Dr. Stevens rejects Paul's leading interpretation partly because it was the result of his training in Rabbinic theology. That the *forms* of Paul's apprehension of the meaning of the Cross were derived from his Jewish training cannot be denied ; but was there no substantial reality underlying these forms of thought ? Was not the Pauline, and the first-Christian inter-

pretation of the Cross generally, really reached under the influence of the Holy Spirit? But how can we recognize the reality of the Spirit's guidance of these men if, not only the form, but the very substance of their thought concerning the Cross was wrong or mistaken? They would be made wrong thus in their very conception of God.

Paul, as Dr. Stevens says, regarded the death of Christ as meeting the demands of "the law" for the sinner's "death," that God's moral righteousness might be vindicated, that "God might be just and the justifier of him who believes in Jesus." He was "made sin for us," "made a curse," we are justified in His blood, etc.

That the *forms* under which Paul apprehended the Cross were derived from his Jewish training is no contradiction to the reality of the Spirit's teaching, provided that the underlying substance which they were meant to express was *there*. Paul could not have apprehended it otherwise unless he had been made over again. It is quite true also that these Jewish forms of thought do not have the same direct and immediate application to *us* as they had to those who were Jews. We, certainly, were never under the Jewish Law. No death-penalty stands written against us as it stood against the sinner under the Law. No Christian man can believe that "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." We cannot say, in the same sense as the Jew, that Christ has made us "free from the law," or that He has "redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." It is true that death—natural, physical death—stands before us all; but we cannot regard physical death as the penalty of sin. It is a necessary consequence of our limited bodily life; it is here in order to the perpetuation and furtherance of life on the earth. Had it not been for physical death, not one of us would have been in the world to-day. Physical death comes to saint and sinner alike. It could not be the

absence of physical death that Paul referred to when he spoke of that "passing over of sins" which made the Cross necessary as a manifestation of God's righteousness; for it had never been absent. The death-penalty under the law was a violent death, an off-cutting in judgment, death as a punishment for sins. "The soul that sinneth it shall die" cannot refer to merely natural death, for that happened equally to the soul that was "righteous," or that turned from sin to righteousness. It was not the mere death of Christ, but (in one aspect) the violent death of Christ, that Paul interpreted as a substitute for that death for sin which the law threatened the sinner with. We can easily understand how Paul, truly under the Spirit's guidance, was led to this interpretation, and we can see and acknowledge that it cannot have the same immediate reference or application to us as it had to those who were "under the law." But Paul applies the same principle to all men—to the Gentile as well as to the Jew. Though not under the written Jewish Law, the Gentile showed the work of the law written in his heart. His works proved that he was as truly under sin as was the Jew, and his conscience, Paul affirmed, bore witness that they who did certain sinful things deserved "death," that is, death as a visitation, death as a punishment, death as representing the supreme punishment at the hands of a righteous God. This visitation had not fallen on men as a recognized fact in the Divine procedure, and the proclamation of Divine forgiveness in Christ went forth freely to all, Jew and Gentile alike. Was God, then, indifferent to sin? So it might appear. But all this was, Paul said, in the merciful forbearance of God, that He might have mercy upon all. Now at length the Divine righteousness had been manifested in the suffering and death of Christ in the name of all, while at the same time the Divine forgiveness went forth to all.

Now, it may be said that this wider application of the

Cross is still based on the Jewish legal conception, and that there are points at which Paul's reasoning is inconclusive ; that all that can be validly inferred from an appeal to the universal conscience is that we are all under a moral law and that sin is an evil and deserves to be punished. But this much certainly *can* be inferred, and is inferred, by all normally constituted consciences. Do not all feel certain also that sin cannot be allowed to perpetuate itself in an eternal Kingdom of God ? Is it also certain that sin is not visibly punished in this world as men's consciences tell them it deserves to be punished, and that God sends a gracious message of forgiveness to all ? Is it not necessary then, Paul would ask (and surely it is a question that we must ask as well), that some adequate manifestation of God's righteousness should be made in the world—some such manifestation as Paul believed was made by the suffering and death of Christ in our name and in our behalf, if God is to be known in His true relation to sin, and if the Gospel of His grace is to go forth with moral, that is saving, power into the sinful world ? It is from sin that God seeks to save men ; it is sin that is the source of all the evil in the world ; sin is not only something against God, but against man himself ; “ the wages of sin is death ”—the death of the soul, that separation from God or exclusion from His eternal Kingdom which is the only thing man needs to fear. If then God in His love was to save men from sin, must not the reality, the evil, the doom of sin be in some way impressively manifested ? The Christian consciousness in general, as well as that of Paul, has seen that manifestation in Christ's suffering and death on the Cross and has felt its moral power. Leave out this aspect of the Cross, and a very essential element of its moral power is gone.

It is true that forgiveness has always been free to the penitent sinner and that Christ preached the Divine forgiveness

before He endured the Cross. It is also true that all proceeds from the love of God, and that the Divine mercy, and not the Cross, is the ground of the Divine forgiveness. But the question is not that of the ground of forgiveness, but whether it was necessary, along with the Divine forgiveness, that God's absolute moral righteousness in relation to sin should be made manifest to the world. Dr. Stevens does not deny that this was necessary; he affirms that it was made; but he denies that it was made in this way by Christ on His Cross. But what is often overlooked is that the question here is not as to the forgiveness of the penitent sinner, but as to that "passing over of sins" in general of which Paul speaks, and as to that proclamation of Divine forgiveness to the whole sinful world that goes forth through Christ. The Cross was the great appeal of God to men. There He was "reconciling the world to Himself" and pleading with men to enter into that reconciliation. But at the same time, said Paul, so far from sin being made to appear a light thing, Christ who knew no sin was "made sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him"—justified and saved. "*In Him*," because of what He did in our name and of what He is unto us. The "righteousness" and salvation come to us through that Cross on which our sin was acknowledged by Christ in our name. Suppose that no such manifestation of the Divine righteousness and of the reality and evil of sin had been made, suppose that a Gospel simply of mercy and forgiveness had been preached to the world, the evil of sin being illustrated only, as Dr. Stevens says it was, by what Christ suffered in order to bring it to us, would it have had the same moral influence on men as the actual Gospel of the Cross has had? Even if it had moved men sufficiently, would it have satisfied their own consciences so as to give them that assured "peace with God" which is at the very foundation of the filial life toward Him? That faith in a Christ who

died for us can produce this assured peace and at the same time quicken or renew the moral nature is one of the most remarkable effects of the Gospel, strongly attesting its Divine origin. If men do not see God to be absolutely righteous and sin to be necessarily doomed to the death of exclusion from the Eternal Kingdom, how can they be effectually saved from sin and brought really into full filial fellowship with God? A moral theory, therefore, if it is to be complete, must, we say, embrace in some form, as an essential and prominent element, that conception of the manifestation of the Divine righteousness and the evil and doom of sin which Paul saw in the Cross and which has been the very life of evangelical Christianity.

Before attempting to answer the question, in what form can we to-day, with the full assent of reason and conscience, apprehend this aspect of the work of Christ, let us turn for a moment to the relation of the Cross to Christ's own teaching and work in general. This must of course be, as Dr. Stevens insists, the guiding light in all our attempts to understand the Cross, and the final test of theories. We do not at present insist on any special interpretation of the various sayings of Christ with respect to His Cross, nor do we point now to the picture in Isaiah of the suffering Servant of Jehovah which we believe was in His mind. But it is certain that, at the last, in Gethsemane, Christ accepted the Cross solely in obedience to the will of His Father in relation to the fulfilment of His mission in the world. The object of that mission was certainly, as stated by Dr. Stevens, to bring men to God, to repentance, to faith, to sonship, to membership in the Kingdom of God—in Christ's own comprehensive phrase, to bring in the Kingdom of God—the reign of His grace and of His Will in the world. It was, & again, to establish "the new covenant" which w
on the Divine forgiveness of sin and which should l

dwelling of God with men. His words and bearing after His final acceptance of the Cross show His conviction that it should be the means of accomplishing the great Divine work committed to Him. His blood should seal the new Covenant; the redemption which the Passover foreshadowed should then be fulfilled; after His death He should drink the new wine with His disciples in His Father's Kingdom.

(1) Now we ask, in the first place, Why was it necessary that Christ should suffer as He did in order to the accomplishment of His mission? No doubt His enemies put Him to death; but He accepted His Cross, not as compelled by the forces that were arrayed against Him, but solely because it had been made plain to Him that it was His Father's will that He should do so. It was not because He could not have been saved from it, but because the grace of God to the world's salvation could only go forth effectually in that way. And why should He not only have to die but to suffer as He did, in the silence of God and with that absence of the sense of His Father's presence that was allowed to come upon Him? Why should He, to whom that presence was the very light of life, be left without it in that hour of completest obedience to His Father's will? Do not these questions find their most reasonable answer on the theory that Christ was there as the Representative of sinful men whom God in His love was seeking to save from their sin? That, is, if we believe in the reality of God and in the possibility of His manifesting His Presence to men—above all to Him who stood in such a relationship of Sonship to Himself as no one on the earth ever did before or has done since, and who had, up to that moment, lived in the closest fellowship with His Father. That Christ did in His life experience a special communion with God is essential to our conception of Christianity as divinely true. Why was it not manifested just at this particular stage? Dr. Stevens says

of the cry on the Cross, that "it seems more accordant with this old Testament exclamation (for such it is, Ps. xxii. 1), as well as more congruous with Jesus' view of the reciprocal relation between the Father and Himself, to suppose abandonment to suffering, rather than abandonment to God's displeasure or to desertion to be meant." No doubt ; but it is just this abandonment to suffering without the sustaining sense of His Father's presence on the part of one who had hitherto enjoyed it, that requires to be explained. Had Christ accepted his Cross simply to bring men to repentance, (etc.), as is suggested, He would have known *why* He had to suffer.

(2) Let us ask, in the second place, In what way was the great Divine purpose committed to Christ actually accomplished through the Cross ? How did it bring in the Kingdom of God's grace and love ? It, was, undoubtedly, by means of that interpretation of the Cross which Paul and the other Christian Apostles reached under the influence of the Holy Spirit that proceeded so largely through the Cross. It was by means of that interpretation of the Cross in which they apprehended it as a sacrifice for sin, and as meeting the demands of the law—the Jewish law and the universal law of righteousness—so that God could be "just and yet the Justifier" of sinners believing in Christ. It was an interpretation which, accepted in faith, enabled men to draw nigh to God with confidence in His forgiving love. It did away with "the Law," whose demands had all been met, and introduced in its stead the Kingdom of Grace, winning men's hearts for God, who had so loved them as to give up His Son so to die for them. It cannot be doubted that it was this interpretation of the Cross that actually served that Divine purpose the realization of which was the supreme end of the life of Christ. That it was first reached under certain Jewish presuppositions does not alter the fact ; it was, as we have seen, inevitable that it

should be so reached. By means of this interpretation of the Cross the effectual coming of the Kingdom of Grace was accomplished for the whole world, and by means of it, in one form or another, it has remained effectual for the greater part of Christendom. We are privileged to-day to rejoice in the light of that revelation of Divine Fatherhood and Grace which came to men through that very interpretation of the Cross. Not only has the burdensome Jewish law disappeared, but, while the moral law that rules the life can never pass away, provision has been made for turning the rule of mere outward law into the inward law of love. Through this interpretation the power of God has certainly gone forth into the world to work towards its salvation. Can we believe that all this rests on pure illusion, that this interpretation of the Cross was a radically mistaken one, that there was not, deeper than all that we may credit to Jewish beliefs merely, a profound Divine reality? Can we still have the Gospel in all its power if we leave this out?

Dr. Stevens presses us hard for a distinct statement of what that reality was. Let us endeavour to state it in the light of St. Paul's interpretation of the Cross. He admits that Paul's statements in Romans iii. do not necessarily imply "penal" suffering on the part of Christ. If "penal" implies punishment, then, of course, Christ could not, as an individual person, be punished. He is expressly set forth as "He who knew no sin." Not knowing sin, He could not suffer as a sinner. How far His sympathy might carry Him into participation with such suffering as sin deserved is, however, another question. Dr. Stevens speaks of Christ taking us into His own sense of the evil of sin. How does He do this? Nor have we anything in Paul which suggests that God demanded a sacrifice before He would or could forgive sin, or that He sought "satisfaction" to His offended

honour, or outraged law, or retributive justice, etc. These, and many other forms of statement, are in theological, not in Scriptural terms. What is implied in Paul's statement is simply that in consequence of God's "passing over of sin," and in view of His proclamation of forgiveness to the sinful world, it was necessary, in order to the salvation of men, (*from sin*) that a manifestation of His moral righteousness in relation to sin should be made, and that this was made in the suffering and death of Christ in the name of sinful men. His suffering and death there as their representative before the gospel of forgiveness could go forth in its full power, and (according to the representations of the Gospels) in order that it might so go forth, was a sufficient manifestation of the Divine righteousness in relation to the sin which God was forgiving. This done, the Gospel could go freely forth so as to save men.

Dr. Stevens wishes to know what was the precise relation of the Cross to man's sin ; what it was that Christ did that showed forth the righteousness of God in relation to sin ; how the suffering of Christ, endured at the hands of sinful men, could be, in any real sense, a bearing of our sins or a manifestation of God's righteousness in view of sin. But, as we have seen, it all came upon Him *in the will of God*, with a Divine saving purpose in it. We can say *certainly* that Christ accepted it all in order that the Divine purpose might be accomplished, in order that God's grace might go forth effectually to men with saving power. Why it could only go forth effectually *thus* is the real question. Certainly the Cross was not to "satisfy God," but to save men. It was not meant to operate on God, but on men. It was something which, under the Spirit's influence, men should so interpret as that it should become a power of God to their salvation. It was not Jewish training merely that led them to this interpretation. The conscience had a large part in it ;

men felt that there Christ suffered what sin really deserved to suffer ; that there God's righteous condemnation of sin was revealed as truly as His love for sinners. And they believed that Christ could so suffer for them because He was (as all admit) our Representative—the Representative Man in whose death, as Paul said, we all died.

Now, *if Christ accepted* His sufferings and death, not as that which was due to Himself personally, but as that which the sin of the men whom He represented deserved, which sin needed to be so acknowledged and set forth, if men were to be truly saved, do not His sufferings and death become to us a real bearing of our sins, and a manifestation of the righteousness of God in relation to sin ? Do we need anything more definite than this ? We may raise various logical difficulties as to the procedure if we choose ; but may it not still be found that “ the foolishness of God is wiser than men ” ? It is not a *legal* transaction we have before us—one in which such definitions are required as theologians have often sought to give with reference to the Cross ? It is something primarily for the conscience to interpret. If in the Cross we see Christ voluntarily enduring such suffering and death as our consciences tell us we as sinners deserved rather than Christ, and doing this for our sakes in order to manifest the Divine righteousness in relation to sin and to enable us to take to our hearts with confidence and with saving power the proclamation of the Divine forgiveness, do we not have in this all that is essential ? Such words as “ legal,” “ penal,” “ satisfaction,” etc., are quite unnecessary and only confuse the mind. Is it not just by seeking logical and legal definitions for that which was a *great Divine act*, appealing first of all to the consciences and the hearts of men, that theologians have often erred and have surrounded the Cross with a legion of needless difficulties ? The Cross, preached as what Christ suffered in consequence

of our sins in order to bring to us the assurance of the Divine forgiveness and to save us from sin,—which no theory can dispute,—makes quite a sufficient appeal to men apart from all minute disputation and definition. The conscience will still interpret the Cross in the old way ; it will still see in it what Paul saw in it—a manifestation of the Divine righteousness as well as of the Divine love. Very few of those who believe that “ Christ died for me,” that He “ suffered for my sins so that the Divine forgiveness might come to me in spite of my sinfulness,” who have “ peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,” and have had a new life of love kindled in their heart, could give any theological explanation of the Cross. It was a *Divine* act which the Divine Wisdom knew would be so interpreted that the Divine Grace could reach men so as to save them.

But we by no means admit that there need be any discord between the Conscience and the Reason in view of the Cross. The Cross stood, as Paul said, in the Wisdom of God, and (whether we can reach it or not) its rationale in relation to sin can assuredly be reached by deeper thought. We may approach it by asking, in the first place, how men’s sins are dealt with in this world in the righteousness of God. They are not always visited by direct external infliction of punishment ; the wicked man may prosper in his wickedness, and there may be no bands in his death. Evil is apparently suffered to proceed untouched and unchecked, so that men are often compelled to ask whether there be a God who judges on the earth. Some impressive manifestation of the evil of sin and of God’s Righteousness is sorely needed.

But does sin really go unpunished ? No ; Christ, above all others, has made us feel certain that sin becomes its own punishment. The sinner reaps in his own character the reward of his unrighteousness, even, it may be, to the extent

of the loss of his soul, the destruction of his higher nature. This is true of the individual. But God does not deal with men as separate individuals merely ; we stand also before Him in families, in communities, in nations, in Humanity as a whole ; and it is in these relationships that we *see* most plainly the consequences of sin. They come on the innocent as well as on the guilty : the innocent are continually suffering from the sins of the guilty. Not only do the sins of the fathers fall on the children, but the sufferings consequent on the sins of an individual member of a family often come with much greater force on some innocent representative member of the family than they do on the immediate sinner. So it is with the sins of a people or of a nation. These often come in the fullest measure on those who had no direct part in the sins, but who are bound up with the sinners in a common collective life. They may come, most manifestly, on some patriotic representative of the people, or on some pre-eminently righteous person, as in Israel the sins of the nation are set forth as lighting on the head of the righteous Servant of Jehovah. It was the sins of his people He was bearing—their consequences, their penal consequences, in the wide sense of the term, must we not say ? So again, God deals with Humanity as a unity. Man brings blessing or suffering on himself and on his fellow-men. The individual is suffered to go on his way, but the consequences of his sins—their punishment—take effect, not only on the individual sinner's own nature, but—as suffering—on those who are associated with him. We all share, more or less, in the fruits of the righteousness and in the results of the evil-doing of Humanity as a whole. No man can wholly cut himself off from the well-doing or from the ill-doing of the race. Humanity is a unity—an organic unity—before God. It stands, not merely in its individual members, but as a single man before the Divine Righteous-

ness. And, therefore, the sufferings which manifest a rule of righteousness, or which are the results of departure from righteousness, come on the personally innocent as well as on the personally guilty. Now, Christ was the true Representative of this our Humanity—its genuine Head. In His personal character He represented it in its true life before God. But Humanity in itself was a sinful Humanity—the race that He represented was one that, as a whole, had departed from righteousness; it was as yet a Humanity “after the flesh,” not “after the Spirit.” As such it was under the necessary condemnation of God; as such it was doomed to perish, not because of any arbitrary Divine decree of punishment, but because sin becomes its own punishment; the wages of sin, in its very nature, is “death.”

Now, if God was to save this sinful Humanity (and only God could save it) must not this, its true relation before the Divine Righteousness, be impressively manifested, so as to be felt by the consciences of men? Otherwise the salvation will not go deep enough. Must not He who truly represented this Humanity before God bow before the Divine Righteousness in recognition of its sin and of the necessary doom of sin? Was not Christ only standing true to His representative capacity in so acknowledging our sin in order that the Divine Grace should reach the sinful world so as to save it? If Christ was really (as Dr. Stevens, and all, admit) the Representative Man, is it any wonder to see Him called to make this recognition of the sin of the race He represented, in order to save it from its sin?

But this is not all. In that act we can see Christ as, in the most literal sense, “bearing our sins.” All His suffering was directly caused by sinful men; but as such it truly expressed the consequences of sin as these had gone on accumulating. In the characters of those men who cruci-

fied the Son of God the sin of man found its culminating expression. It came to a head there, and this, as the consequence of sin upon sin. Apart from Christ, those consequences, in their last result, could only have come on this sinful Humanity itself with a destructive force. Christ suffered them to fall upon Himself in order to save the world—in order to turn back that tide of sin which would otherwise have submerged the race. He became that “Lamb of God” who bore, so as to take away, the sin of the world. He placed Himself where the results of men’s sins—in which their real punishment always lies—fell upon Him in their ultimate, extremest form. Looking to Him as He suffers on that Cross, we sinners of the world can truly make our own the confession of those who beheld, and were led to interpret rightly, the suffering of the righteous Servant of Jehovah: “All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has caused to light on Him the iniquities of us all.”

Christ thus literally “bore our sins in His own body on the tree,” not by sympathy merely, but by suffering what the sin of man brought upon Him, as that sin had gone on reaping its punishment in increasing sinfulness. The righteousness of God in relation to sin was thus impressively set forth, the destructive nature of sin was revealed, and the grace of God for the world’s salvation went forth in the fulness of its power through the Cross.

All this was done by Christ, as our Representative, dying “for all,” as Paul said, that we who representatively died with Him, or in Him, might live a new justified and righteous life unto God. The *moral* death that we must die with Christ (of which Dr. Stevens says so much) is based on this representative death of us all in or with Christ. It is not “ye *must* die with Christ,” but “ye *died*” in Him. Only because we have been thus united with Him in His

death is it possible for us to become united with Him in His life (which, of course, implies union with Him in His death in the spiritual or moral sense). It is not primarily such a moral appeal that God sends us in the Gospel, but a proclamation of Divine *grace*, through the Cross, such as will both give peace to the conscience and stimulate it to new life. To go back from "grace" as the first word to sinful men is to go back from the Gospel. The Faith in which we are saved is a faith that accepts Christ as our Representative, that endorses His act on our behalf, and accepts God's assurance of its sufficiency. Union with Christ in Spirit follows and results from union with Him in His representative death. It is its natural consequent indeed. For in Christ "the flesh" died utterly, and all those who accept that representation for themselves die in principle with Christ and have only before them the new life of the Spirit. Therefore it was that Paul said that thenceforth he "knew no man after the flesh."

The Christian life, whether it be described as spiritual or as ethical, or as mystical, arises naturally out of this union with Christ in His representative death on our behalf. Sin doomed man in the flesh to "death"; but Christ has acknowledged in our name the necessity of this, so that, although we are consciously sinners, we can take to ourselves confidently the Divine forgiveness and know ourselves made heirs of eternal life. *Therefore* the Christian feels that it is for him "no longer to live to the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God"; for in Christ he "died," and his true life is "hid with Christ in God."

The Divine grace thus comes to us through the Cross in direct continuation and completion of the work of Christ prior to His Cross. It comes to us with saving power. It comes "convincing of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," moving us to turn from sin to God who so loved us

as to give up His Son to die for us, in order that His grace might reach us in unison with that Righteousness in being raised to which alone *salvation* is to be found. We repeat, therefore, that unless this conception of the Cross be embraced in a doctrine of the Cross, it cannot be a completely moral one.

[The writer of the foregoing may be permitted to say that in his Book, *The Cross and the Kingdom*, he sought to confine himself to what he believed could be fairly inferred from the Synoptic narratives alone; St Paul's Doctrine of the Cross was dealt with in his previous work, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*].

W. L. WALKER.

A DAUGHTER OF JACOB.

THE conversation between Jesus and the woman of Samaria passes into the first of its deeper phases with the Lord's remark, *If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.*

If thou knewest. But she did not know. She failed as yet to realize her opportunity. The woman was upon the edge of the supreme moment in her life, and apparently she could find nothing better to do than talk and tease, until it seemed as if she would actually allow the chance to go, oblivious of its size and offer. For, as not unfrequently is the case in human experience, the turning-point came unawares. Nothing warned this woman of the significance attaching to the conversation or of the wide possibilities with which she was trifling in this interview. No presentiment, inward or outward, had she of the crisis, ere swiftly and quietly it was upon her. The sunlight flickering on the sand, the stones and water of the well, the common sights and sounds of the place, were as they had been on

countless other days, while she herself had probably trudged out with her pitcher in that listless mood which renders people too dull to expect any fresh experience or any vital change.

If thou knewest. The keen sense of capacity and aspiration may readily flicker out of life. Any thought of a God actually moving and speaking, or breaking into the circle of experience, is practically as foreign to certain people as it was to this woman. And sometimes for much the same reason. The trouble is that they stand upon a level where religion is presented mainly in the past or in the future tense, rather than as a reality for present experience, a force and factor of to-day. *Our father Jacob*, she exclaimed; and then, *When Messiah cometh*—as though religion were to be resolved into antiquarian retrospect or apocalyptic prospect. She could talk glibly of past religious history and of future hopes, but it is curious to observe that the single point of connexion between her and contemporary religion evidently lay in religious controversies, upon which she could speak freely and sarcastically, with that perverted sense of superiority which marks those who in print or conversation love to toss words about religion and the churches. Any notion of God as a living presence, or as one who had a personal interest in herself, had practically faded from her mind. In her case, doubtless, insensibility to God was not due, as it was with Nicodemus, to that subtle satisfaction with oneself which has been properly termed “the chief inward enemy to grace.” The juxtaposition of the two figures is a dramatic touch of the author which has been often noted. But it has not been so often noted that one point of this contrast consists in the fact that both are represented as unconscious of Christ’s claims upon them, the one owing to the complacency that deems no further attainment needful, the other owing to that

cheerful acquiescence with a low level which loss of reputation and a stained past are too apt to instil. Expectancy was lacking in both natures. It cost this woman, as it cost Nicodemus, a real effort to understand that the revelation of Jesus means some fresh experience for the highest as for the lowest. At the outset, neither expected anything new or strange or great at the hands of God ; nor, as the author plainly hints, was such expected of them by other people, the one being regarded as too good, the other as too degraded, for anything of the kind.

“ I do not wonder,” said Ruskin once, “ at what men suffer : but I wonder often at what they lose.” A pregnant saying ; only, we might add that suffering streams out often through loss, and that losses are due frequently to nothing else than insensibility. It is so in religion. As the old proverb has it, God comes to us without bell, and the conception of this pulsing environment lends an unwonted wealth and zest, especially to lives which happen to be beset by apparently inexorable limitations of circumstance. This truth, beloved and believed, renders life, in short, more modest and intense. It is a favourite idea of the author of the fourth gospel, and it recurs in the first epistle of John. *If thou knewest the free gift of God . . . Ye did not choose me, but I chose you . . . Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us . . . We love because he first loved us.* It is the chord of graciousness ; the spontaneity, the priority, of God—God always first, his love the cause and the condition of ours, God moving under and behind all human aspiration, communion starting not from man’s side but from God’s.

God comes to us
With every day, with every star that rises,
In every moment dwells the Righteous,
And starts upon the soul with sweet surprises.

The initiative is with him. The soul is touched, not self-impelled, to finer issues.

One reason for laying stress upon this truth may have been a desire upon the part of the writer of the fourth gospel to correct the prevailing semi-philosophic conception of religion as the upward struggling movement of the human spirit to attain divine communion. This motif is audible enough elsewhere in the book. But a more practical interest perhaps lay nearer to his mind. Note how he represents the first word of direction and comfort spoken by Christ to this woman as this: *If thou knewest the gift of God, thou wouldest ask. The gift is the free gift*; it is Paul's strong, rich term, ἡ δωρεά. And there is a remarkable intention in this method of delineation. For the generosity and spontaneity of God are precisely what many people, like this woman, find it hardest to realize. Like her it is possible that we may allow ourselves gradually to become so pro-occupied with the sectarian animosities and vendettas of the religious world, that the thought of an untrammelled free boon tends to wither even out of our conceptions of God. Or, the very eagerness and need of self-exertion in religion, the duties of prayer and watchfulness and service, may lead us to exaggerate at times the function of the will in faith. Or, for a more general reason, there may be some difficulty about believing heartily in the Divine liberality and generosity. Paradoxical as it may seem, that belief has never proved quite easy to human nature. It takes God to convince men of God's spontaneous love. Primitive paganism, for example, was usually haunted by an incurable suspicion of the gods, as though they were jealous of mankind. The ancient legends explain, with a deliberate and pathetic emphasis, how such comforts as fire and the like had to be stolen or extorted from reluctant deities; while nothing, it may be fairly said, lay further

from the average pagan mind than the conception of a God freely benefiting men, of a divine being whose favour had not to be won by force or fraud. Survivals of this pagan spirit cling to human nature still. Uneconsciously they reappear, for example, in people who tacitly assume, in practice if not in theory, that the initiative in religion rests with man rather than with God.

Think you 'mid all this mighty sum
Of things for ever speaking,
That nothing of itself will come,
But we must still be seeking ?

To how many people in the religious world might not Wordsworth's verse of remonstrance be applied ? To how many of us, it must be confessed, a God who can be found is really more credible than a God who finds ? How often God who may be worshipped seems more intelligible than one who actually *seeks worshippers to worship him* ? A welcoming Father, is not that now and then more authentic to the faith of men than a Redeemer who comes to *seek and save* ?—for sometimes, if he is to save, he must seek and seek for long. Even upon a fairly trained Christian belief is it not occasionally a strain to preserve a simple belief in a God who acts on us and for us freely, having access to us in ways beyond our consciousness, and influencing us of his own accord ? May there not be a danger that the shadow even of our own suspiciousness and ill-fortune, as well as of our self-assertion, may fall across our conceptions of the divine nature ? For in some cases the generous hopes and trustful impulses with which people start in life are rudely beaten down in actual experience, as advantage is taken of their good-nature. It was so with this daughter of Jacob. Like her, some learn to be shrewd and suspicious of their neighbours, till frankness and graciousness ebb almost out of their relations with one another. They dole

out gifts, as this woman doled out her tardy boon of water to the thirsty Christ, perpetually on their guard against being taken in or imposed upon. They distrust any lavish profession of goodwill. They suspect designs in the simplest claims. And the further mischief and misery is the latent reaction of this spirit upon their religion, till a certain reluctance is insensibly associated with God himself, as though he too bargained somehow with men, instead of seeking them without reserve, without any grudging, and without demanding guarantees from them.

If I mistake not, this feature of human faith or incredulity was present to the mind of the writer as he penned the dialogue between Jesus and the woman of Samaria. It is met implicitly in the words, *If thou knewest the free gift of God, and who it is that is speaking to thee.* Christ, in short, is adduced as the convincing answer to such a scruple or hesitating faith. His person and revelation furnish the plainest evidence that God makes a real and disinterested offer of himself to men. For *the free gift of God*, it is suggested, instead of being an abstract boon, is simply an expression for God giving, and giving of himself in Jesus, in ways that are tender, wise, inimitable, various. Christ is himself the Giver and the Gift. The mercies and promises of God are not some vague, magnificent idea, but personally conveyed to men through Jesus, rippling upon human experience through a life like to our own. God spared not his Son, and the Son spared not himself, to make the gift real to mankind. And as the higher gifts cannot be conferred apart from some capacity or sensitiveness in the receiver—since you may not receive an influence as you do a flower or a coin—the preliminary task of God is to stir in men, as in this puzzled, heedless woman, those feelings of uneasiness and wistfulness and vague dissatisfaction which are the earliest symptoms of a diviner change. Such is the

process of discipline. Christ and this woman met that afternoon. *Then cometh he . . . to the well. There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water.* But his thirst for her awoke before her thirst for him. He was a stranger to her, but she soon discovered that her life was not wholly strange to him. And that, as the writer implies, was the saving of her. For, in the last resort, everything must depend upon the insight, the initiative, the persistence, the wise handling, of him who is first at the divine tryst of the soul. To be trusted by one person has often proved the saving of a man. To be understood by a single human being may be a moral redemption for blunted and lowered lives. And in a sense is it not still the gift of gifts to be assured of God's belief in us? Men are justified by God's faith in them as well as by their faith in him. They awake at times to find themselves believing in him because, in spite of their unpromising past and as unpromising present, he generously believes in them.

"The most melancholy thought," as George Eliot once wrote to Mr. F. W. H. Myers, "surely would be that we in our own persons had measured and exhausted the sources of spiritual good." To have the opposite of this brought home to us, even in disconcerting ways, can hardly fail to prove a spring of cheer and strength. *If thou knewest . . . thou wouldst ask.* This sense of human capacity and need, and of a God who lives and loves to meet it, it is one function of Christ to create amid our conventional religion, where a bias, half creditable, half deplorable, is always reappearing towards complacency and self-sufficiency. The whole impression made by the life and spirit of Jesus, according to this gospel, goes to excite and justify man's faith in the great generosity of God; if people, it is implied, had any living sense of that, they would all be asking, and none would ask in vain. For faith is, in the last analysis, not a contrivance, the rare product of some spiritual craving. The life with God is some-

thing larger than the struggle of man's soul to reach and to persuade God of its need. *My soul followeth hard after thee.* Yes, but while the consciousness of our own mental and moral powers often comes first in the order of experience, the condition of such efforts has always to be added—*thy right hand upholdeth me.* Communion with God is no adventure of a pioneer on dim, unsounded seas. Prayer is not the clamour of a soul beating at the high gates of heaven. The impulse to all these forms of agony and effort, fortunately for most people, rises from the previous working of God's free love and purpose, that make their way down into our lethargy and underlie even our most spontaneous and instinctive moments. Men are born into Christianity, says our author elsewhere, *not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God.* And this work is no series of fitful impulses, but a stream of steady purpose ever falling and flowing through the shadows of the world upon the faith, aye and upon the very incredulity, of men.

For this regeneratíng movement can reach down to any level or line of experience, not only to intellectual conceit, to the patronizing, good-humoured attitude assumed by men like Nicodemus towards religion, but also to those who are morally unsatisfactory, to the disappointing and the disappointed, to those who, if ever they think about their soul, regard it as a bird with broken wing. Of the latter class the writer presents this woman as one type. His study of her is a study of moral regeneration. What, he would suggest, what though we may have tasted the heartlessness of other people, the emptiness that follows indulgence in hot passions, or the drudgery and vicissitudes of life? What though we are prejudiced and ignorant and shallow? What of all that, when under our vain and vacant moods, beneath the accumulation of trivial and sensual circumstances, Christ is here to stir, in our bewildered and stained characters, a

fountain of fresh hope towards God? He gets behind our evasion and levity for nothing else. He steps, as it were, into human life just for that purpose.

To realize that, is the point on which all turns. *If thou knewest!* This woman came to know it. *Our father Jacob*, she said, and she was a truer daughter of Jacob than perhaps she understood. For as her ancestor once awoke in a strange bare place to find God had been beside him, though he knew it not, so centuries later did this woman of Sychar realize Christ's presence with a start of wonder. And so, centuries later still, do we. For the revelations of life surge upon us often as they surged upon her, along some ordinary, simple channel. Most people are familiar with the experience of being disappointed over some notable place or person. The visit is made with keen expectation, yet some return pretty much as they went, curiously unmoved. They are ready to blame themselves or other people for the failure of their high hopes. The event has failed to come up to anticipations. Upon the other hand, it is well and wise to make sure that the opposite law and truth of experience shall not be forgotten, viz., that some of the best influences and most regenerating impulses which reach life, arrive in the guise of the mechanical, the casual, and the commonplace. Such moments, strange and sudden, vary in intensity. But what seems common to them all is the heightening of our personal life, which in the religious sphere is tantamount to a keener sense of the Divine presence in us and with us. It is the change from vague, conventional expectation to definite experience, from *When Messiah cometh, he will tell us all things*, to *See a man which told me all things that ever I did*. Suddenly through a conversation, or a reverie in some glen or lane, through a phrase of music, a text of Scripture, a sentence in some book, God starts upon us as upon our sister at Samaria, with some noiseless, arresting experience, some reaction

against the lower self, some disturbance of our languor and prejudices. In a flash, as it were, life seems to fall apart, leaving us face to face with a Presence that will not be put by. We see things for a brief season in a new light. Life appears rearranged in nobler forms, with openings and opportunities near us. The inertia of things is broken up. What hitherto has slept in the ear now burns in the heart. Christ is known in the breaking of the bread. Through some casual and ordinary event, as it were, God becomes more real and near and dear to us, and the result is that from these precious, pregnant moments we go back to life with something—something intimate, holy, and abiding, that often makes the world a new place to us afterwards.

† No attainments can outgrow the need of this free, glad visitation. Nicodemus, the teacher of Israel, has to be surprised by the unwonted range opened up for the respectable character by the presence of the living Christ, with whom influence means possession. But equally so, the writer of this gospel implies, must the daughter of Jacob learn that no failure need disqualify for these moments of development. These entrances into the higher fellowship with God are not forfeited by the poor penitent. For such is the wonder and wealth of human life, as it lies beset by God in Christ, that none forfeits wholly his opportunity of growth, nor is any beyond the reach of him who stoops to win men from their shallowness and failures, who is here to give them heaven on earth, and give it for the asking.

JAMES MOFFATT.

GALATIANS II. 3-5.

THE difficulty of this verse is both textual and exegetical. The ordinary text is as follows : “ But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised ; but because of the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage, to whom we yielded in subjection no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you.”

The textual difficulty is contained in verse 5, and the facts are as follows—there are four variations :—

- (A) *We yielded for an hour*, omitting both *to whom* and *no not*. This is found only in D, but its existence in early Greek MSS. is proved by the evidence of Irenaeus and Victorinus ; it was the reading almost unquestionably in the archetype of G, and is found in the Old Latin, in Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, Primasius, and perhaps other Latin writers. The evidence of Tertullian ought perhaps to be reckoned as a witness for the Greek text.
- (B) *We yielded no not for an hour*, omitting *to whom*. This is the reading of Marcion, and according to Victorinus was found in some Greek MSS. It is also found in the Peshitto Syriac.
- (C) *To whom we yielded for an hour*, omitting *no not*. The existence of this text is borne witness to by Jerome in his commentary on Galatians ; but it does not seem to be supported by any other evidence, or to have been found in Greek MSS.
- (D) *To whom we yielded no not for an hour*. This is found in all Greek MSS. except D, but not in the Syriac or in the Old Latin.

The majority of critics accept the fourth reading without hesitation, but they are hardly justified in their assurance, for reading A is shown to have been dominant in the earliest times in Rome, Africa and Gaul ; while it may be questioned whether the evidence of Irenaeus ought not to be regarded as also covering Ephesus. Except from Alexandria, there seems to be no early evidence (apart from the great uncials) for reading D, and if we except this district the struggle seems to be between readings A and B. Reading C was known to Jerome, but seems to have been merely an attempt to improve the grammar of the sentence, though when this emendation was made it is impossible to say, nor is it obvious where Jerome found it. Everything therefore turns on the date which we ascribe to the text represented by the great uncials, and in the present state of the textual controversy it is impossible to decide definitely between the two following arguments :—

(1) *Reading D may be the original text, while readings A and B represent early attempts to improve the grammar and elucidate the meaning.*

To some extent this is the view of Dr. Hort, Dr. Lightfoot and Prof. Baljon, but the last-named does not discuss the matter at any length, and settles the point on purely subjective grounds ; while the weak point in the arguments of the two Cambridge scholars is that they do not pay sufficient attention to the readings which omit part but not all of the usual text, and deal with the matter as though it were a choice between leaving out or inserting both *to whom* and *no not*. Thus, Dr. Hort claims Marcion, Ambrosiaster and others for reading D, whereas they really support reading B. In the same way Dr. Lightfoot, though recognizing the existence of both variations, seems greatly to underestimate their importance when he says that the two are for the most omitted or retained together.

Dr. Hort's explanation of the origin of reading A is as follows :—

The omission may have been caused partly by the preceding broken construction, partly by $\delta\epsilon$ in *v.* 4, which might seem to require a sense in some degree adverse to that of *v.* 3 (Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, but I did think it right to show a temporary personal deference): it thus apparently presupposes the probably erroneous interpretation of $\text{o}\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon$. . . $\eta\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$ as a statement that Titus was not circumcised at all.

This explanation seems to me to be the best which has yet been offered on this view of the case. Its weak point is that reading C, which is clearly an emendation of reading A, points to the fact that early readers were inclined to regard the text containing the words *with whom* as more intelligible than that which omitted them. It is, of course, possible that readers at a different time and in another place felt differently; but I think that a certain presupposition is thus created against Dr. Hort's view. Moreover, his theory is not supported by the history of exegesis. The early writers, except Marcion, held that Titus was not circumcised; but they did not at first connect the false brethren and the yielding or not yielding of St. Paul with this subject; and when they began to adopt this explanation, as did Jerome, the point in which they manifested a desire to emend the sentence was not the $\text{o}\ddot{\iota}\varsigma$ $\text{o}\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon$ but the preceding $\delta\epsilon$ which they wished to remove or explain (cf. Theodore and Severian in Cramer's *Catena* on this passage), so as to bring the false brethren into direct connexion with the question of Titus. These facts seem somewhat to cut the ground from under Dr. Hort's feet.

Dr. Lightfoot's treatment of the matter (*Epistle to the Galatians*, pp. 121-123) is much less convincing. He endeavours to minimise the evidence by saying that the statement of Victorinus is not worthy of credit; that no

weight attaches to the assertion of Tertullian ; and that the omission by Irenaeus may be ascribed not to the author himself, but to his translator. I do not think that this argument is a very happy example of Dr Lightfoot's methods. The reading in Irenaeus, as Dr. Hort admits, is confirmed by the context, and there is no reason to doubt the evidence of Tertullian, supported as it is by other writers and by Latin MSS., that the omission was found in the earliest Latin texts. Dr. Lightfoot, indeed, partly admits the last fact, but he argues that the expedient of dropping the negative as a means of simplifying the sense is characteristic of the Latin copies. As instances in St. Paul, he quotes Galatians v. 8, Romans v. 14, and 1 Corinthians v. 6 ; but these scarcely prove the point, for in Romans v. 14 the omission of the negative is supported by Origen, in 1 Corinthians v. 6 the words of Augustine—*nonnulli et maxime Latini codices*—imply that the reading was found in some MSS. which were not Latin, and in Galatians v. 8 the omission is supported by D and Origen. The evidence of these passages, especially that given by the quotations of Origen, if it prove anything, proves that when the Latin copies omit a negative they really represent a Greek original, and are not arbitrarily emending.

Nor is Dr. Lightfoot's explanation of the origin of the reading more convincing ; he suggests that it may have been an oversight, or that possibly the negative was intentionally omitted on the ground that the sense of the passage, or the veracity of the Apostle, required the omission. It is true that Tertullian adopts these arguments, but I cannot think that it is at all probable that exegesis on these lines gave rise to the reading ; it is far more likely that the reading gave rise to the exegesis.

(2) *It is possible to argue that there existed readings A and B from an early time, and that both were emended a little*

later by the addition of "to whom," made independently in different localities as an obvious elucidation of the sense. This theory is adopted and most powerfully advocated by Prof. Zahn in his commentary on the Epistle. The strongest point in his argument is that the earliest commentators, with the exception of Marcion, regard *v.* 3 as a parenthesis, and do not connect *v.* 4 with anything except the journey to Jerusalem. The earliest orthodox writer who connects *v.* 4 directly with *v.* 3 is Ambrosiaster, and after his time this is the general explanation. If the $\delta\epsilon$ in *v.* 4 was to retain any adversative meaning, it is clear that it must be taken to imply a suppressed verb, and the reading with $\omicron\iota\varsigma$ was introduced, whether followed or not by a negative, in order to make this plain. As, however, the view was generally held that Titus was not circumcised, the reading which contained the negative naturally soon became the dominant one.

But if readings C and D be rejected on these grounds, it remains for us to decide between readings A and B. Probably most of us would agree with Prof. Zahn that in this case reading A has at first sight superior claims, as Tertullian, Victorinus, and Irenaeus have to be set against Marcion and the Peshitto. But it may be doubted whether Tertullian's accusation against Marcion of falsifying the text in this passage is not greatly to be discounted, as even on the view that reading D is an emendation and not an original reading, it is at least an emendation of, and so far evidence for, reading B, so that to Marcion and the Peshitto must be added the evidence of the text which served as a basis for the probably Alexandrian recension represented by the great uncials. This reduces the problem to one of those difficult places in which the western Greek and African Latin are ranged against the Old Alexandrian and the Syriac. The division of forces is almost equal; and if a

decision is ever to be formed on textual grounds, it will probably not be until we know a little more about the history of the Peshitto version of the Pauline epistles.

Still, until some line of argument is produced which will settle the point in a more objective manner, I think that if reading D be rejected, reading A should probably be given a slight preference over reading B; for even if we reject Tertullian's view of a Marcionite emendation, it remains unquestionable that reading A would have been offensive to all who disliked to believe that St. Paul intended to admit that he had in any degree yielded to the church at Jerusalem on any point even temporarily, and therefore is to be preferred as decidedly the harder reading.

In attempting to judge between these two main lines of argument, one favouring reading D, the other rejecting it and hesitating somewhat between readings A and B, every one is bound to be influenced by his views on the general problems of the text of the New Testament. Personally I believe that the Sinaitic and Vatican uncials (and the mass of MSS. are not independent of them) represent nothing more than the text of one locality—Alexandria—and that probably only in the form which it had reached by the beginning of the fourth century, or at earliest by the middle of the third. As therefore there appears to be no evidence for *οἱ* in the early patristic quotations of this verse, and to be a considerable amount of evidence against it, I am inclined to adopt the second view, and as between the text which contains the negative, and that which does not, to prefer the latter; because I think that, although the evidence is almost equally balanced, it is easier to explain the insertion than the omission of the negative.

The exegesis of these verses is as difficult as the settlement of the text; two broad lines of interpretation have

been followed in the past, and it is impossible to say that either can be excluded with real certainty.

1. It is possible to take *v. 4* in close connexion with *v. 2* as giving the reason why St. Paul went up to Jerusalem or why he consulted the leaders on the subject of his teaching. Using reading A, this is the interpretation which is followed by Tertullian and Irenaeus among the ancients, and by Prof. Zahn among the modern commentators. According to it, *v. 3* is merely a parenthesis, and the *δέ* is a connecting particle with very little adversative force. The meaning of *v. 3* on this hypothesis is no more obvious than on any other, and exegetes have differed, and will probably continue to differ, as to whether the meaning is : (a) That the question of the circumcision of Titus was never raised at all ; (b) that it was raised, but that the demand was resisted ; (c) that it was raised and yielded to, but as an act of free will and not of necessity.

A similar explanation is reached by Prof. Ramsay, who adopts reading D. He also regards *v. 3* as purely a parenthesis, and interprets it in the manner (a), but thinks that the first clause of *v. 4* contains a suppressed verb, and that the second clause is intended to show that the action described was not to be interpreted as the acceptance of a subordinate position. He paraphrases the whole passage as follows : " Now, as I have touched on this point, I may mention parenthetically that not even was my companion Titus, Greek as he was, required to submit to circumcision, much less was the general principle laid down that the Jewish rite was a necessary preliminary to the full membership of the Church. Further, the occasion of my consulting the leading apostles was because of certain insinuating false brethren, who also crept into our society in an unavowed way to act the spy on our freedom (which we free Christians continue enjoying throughout my ministry), in

order to make us slaves to the ritual which they count necessary. But not for an hour did we yield to these false brethren by complying with their ideas, etc."

2. A different line of interpretation was followed by the later Church writers, including Jerome and Ambrosiaster, and has been adopted by Dr. Lightfoot. According to this, *v.* 4 is in close connexion with *v.* 3, and explains the reason for the line of action pursued with regard to Titus. The almost universal explanation among the older writers, which has been followed also by Dr. Lightfoot, is that Titus was not circumcised, and that St. Paul is explaining in *v.* 4 why he refused to yield to pressure in this case, although in the case of Timothy he had permitted his circumcision.

On the other hand, Westcott and Hort, in their Greek Testament, express a preference for the view that the meaning of the passage is that Titus was circumcised, though not under compulsion. (Later on, however, in his *Judaistic Christianity* Dr. Hort gave up this view and adopted that of Dr. Lightfoot.) With reading D perhaps this is right ; but it is possible that, even so, the adversative force of the "but" in *v.* 4 is to be found in an implied reference to the incident of Timothy.

It is impossible not to feel that an exact exegesis of these verses is unattainable. The probable reason—and it is a strong argument for the authenticity of the Epistle—is that we are dealing with a letter referring to facts which are not otherwise recorded. If we knew, as did the Galatians, whether Titus was circumcised or not, the matter would be comparatively simple. My own view, for which I do not claim any noticeable degree of greater probability than for any other, is that Titus was circumcised ; that *v.* 4 is to be taken in close connexion with *v.* 3 ; and that reading A is the true text. On the last point I am influenced by what seems to me the weight of the textual evidence. For

the second and first my only reason is that I think that, in this section of the Epistle, St. Paul is giving his answer to arguments based on the hostile interpretation of certain incidents in his life. One of these was the circumcision of Titus ; and I am inclined to think that St. Paul means in *v.* 3 to deny that he yielded to the compulsion of superior authority, and in *v.* 4 to admit that what he did was perhaps an error of judgement, into which he had been trapped by the false brethren. He therefore wished emphatically to deny that this temporary yielding could be construed as the recognition of superior authority. This interpretation agrees with Professor Ramsay's in thinking that the circumcision of Titus was not made a test case.

My view is that the history of the passage, which explains best the various readings and the early variations in exegesis, is that the early Church, looking at the matter from the point of view of a time when the question of circumcision had been definitely settled, and the circumcision of a Gentile seemed an impossibility, was offended at the idea that St. Paul's Gentile companion had been circumcised, and gladly availed themselves of the ambiguity of the sentence—an ambiguity which arose from their own ignorance of the fact that Titus had been circumcised, that this had been made the ground of attack by St. Paul's opponents, and that he was protesting against the unfairness of this interpretation of his conduct. The result was an exegesis which divorced *v.* 4 from *v.* 3, and explained that the yielding of St. Paul consisted in his exposition of his gospel to the leaders at Jerusalem. A reluctance to admit even this degree of yielding gave rise to the insertion of the negative, possibly by Marcion, and the way was then clear for a reversion to the more natural exegesis which connected the two verses. This reversion was soon made, but the addition of the negative had destroyed the adversative

force of the "but" in *v.* 4, and rendered it, as Jerome perceived, superfluous unless an implied verb, such as "we refused to yield," was understood after "the false brethren," and the feeling that this suppressed verb ought to be understood gave rise to the insertion of the relative in *v.* 4.

Assuming that Titus was circumcised and that reading A is correct, the grammar of the sentence is plain, but the exegesis is repugnant to the view of St. Paul's relation to the community at Jerusalem which was held by the Church of a later date. The latter attempted to find an exegesis which was more palatable to their view of the general situation, and in so doing complicated the grammar; a further step in the same direction corrupted the text, but enabled a return to be made to a more straightforward exegesis without injury to the supposed character of St. Paul; but this destroyed the grammatical balance of the sentence, and a further emendation was made, which resulted in the confusion worse confounded of the ordinary Greek text.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

*THE HIGHER CRITICISM AS IT AFFECTS
FAITH AND SPIRITUAL LIFE :*

A DIALOGUE.¹

LET us suppose that a young man, a clergyman's son, who has just taken a first class in Theology at Oxford, and proposes presently to seek Holy Orders, has come home for a short visit before taking up practical work. His white-haired father, dear and reverend, receives him with a warmth of welcome in which a touch of anxiety can be traced. On the morning after his arrival he calls him into his study, draws up a chair for him on the other side of the fire, and begins the conversation.

“I have been wishing for a long time to have a talk with you about matters which have been causing me some anxiety. Till your examination was over, I did not like to disturb your mind. But the present seems an opportune moment. I have gathered from the books on your shelves, and from other indications, that you have given a good deal of attention to what is called the ‘Higher Criticism.’”

“Yes, that is quite true. It was impossible to avoid it.”

“I have seen somewhere an attempt to explain the use of the term, but I have forgotten it. Would you tell me again what the point of the epithet is ?”

“It is not a very happily chosen term. But it is natural enough. The scientific study of literature, like all other departments of study, has, of course, in recent years been more and more specialized. Accordingly textual criticism, which asks what is the nearest approach to the words written in the original MS. of any writing under consideration, came to be distinguished from that other branch of criticism which asks what is the date, authorship, origin and mode of com-

¹ A paper read before the Christian Conference at Liverpool, March 23, 1905.

position of the document, the first being called the Lower and the latter the Higher Criticism."

"There is then no assumption of superiority in the title?"

"Certainly not, though it must be admitted that some writers have adopted an unwarrantable tone of superiority."

"Then, Dr. Pusey was a Higher Critic as well as Dr. Driver his successor, for each of them have written about the date and authorship of Daniel."

"Certainly."

"How is it, then, that those who think with Dr. Driver are called critics, while those who agree with Dr. Pusey are dubbed conservatives, or traditionalists?"

"Perhaps that is partly the fault of the latter. It has been perceived that, all unconsciously to themselves, they have not, with fresh minds, sought to discover the truth, but, assuming tradition to be truth, have sought facts to support tradition."

"I have heard it said that the latest hypothesis has a similar effect upon its author, who manipulates and selects his facts to fit his theory."

"That is often quite true, but it must be remembered that this only holds good of the author of the theory. It is everybody else's interest to find out a better if he can. So the free play of critical inquiry furnishes a corrective, which tradition lacks."

"Well, my son, I cannot pretend to have followed the details of the critical discussions. My duties leave me little leisure for such work. But I am, I confess, gravely concerned about the unsettling tendency of the views which seem to be more and more widely accepted. These attacks upon the Bible pain me to the heart. I cannot indeed understand how you, my son, brought up as you have been to reverence the Bible as God's word, can in any way countenance them."

“ Oh, father, I assure you that you are mistaken, if you suppose anything of the kind. *My* teachers, at any rate, do not ‘ attack ’ the Bible ; they only seek to overthrow a tradition about the Bible, which in their view completely misrepresents the truth. All their conclusions result from observing and weighing Biblical facts. The principal works on which students rely are built up out of a mass of references, each one of which denotes a Biblical fact. The facts may or may not be rightly interpreted, but they are there in the Bible, and are not the subjective product of a lively imagination.”

“ That is all very well, my son ; these conclusions may not be *intended* as attacks upon the Bible ; but they completely upset the ideas about the Scriptures which I and my older friends have held all our lives, and which we have proved in very varied experiences to hold good. You cannot deny that.”

“ No, father, I cannot honestly say that I have not found it very unsettling to have to adjust the ideas in which I was brought up to the beliefs I have been led to form since I came up to the University. But I would suggest to you that any discovery of serious error in widespread religious beliefs must be unsettling, and that the only fair thing to do is to see whether the newer views, if accepted as true, will in the long run help or hinder the spiritual life.”

“ That, my son, will, I fear, be easily answered. You must admit that in Germany and Holland, where these critical views have had longer time to make their tendencies felt, the evaporation of definite dogmatic belief has proceeded almost to the vanishing point. ‘ *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili.* ’ Why not be content with the ravages of this plague among foreigners, and set to work to stamp it out at home. The correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph*, *Standard* and *Daily Mail*, the *Clarion* publications, and the

output of the Rationalist Press Association, show clearly enough what ammunition the foes of faith can find in critical storehouses.”

“I must of course admit that many critics are radically heterodox, and sit very loose to all forms of dogma. But I am far from admitting that this is a necessary consequence of adopting the side of the moderns in questions of literary criticism. It is indeed one of the triumphs of recent critical work that it has much more successfully than ever before disengaged the discussion of literary and historical questions from the problems of theology and philosophy which are closely connected with them, and lend them their absorbing interest. Strauss made his key first, and then forced it into the lock of the Gospel problem. Schmiedel at least does his best to take a wax mould of the wards before making his key, though in his case, too, we may be permitted to think that a deeper and wider knowledge of the varieties of Christian experience might have enabled him to construct a master key that would open more doors than will yield to his pitiful formula. I admit, then, that many critics have made shipwreck of the ancient faith. I deny that criticism need affect any substantial verity of the Christian creed.”

“It is easy enough, my son, to make sweeping assertions such as that. But I should like to hear you justify them in detail. I assure you I shall be most thankful if you can relieve my mind of some of its anxiety.”

“My dear father, it will be a real happiness to me, if I may try to show you step by step as best I can how I have endeavoured to keep the core and marrow of all that I learned from you, even while I have made many changes in the things that are not central or vital. Where would you like me to begin?”

“I think, before taking up any particular part of the Bible, I should like to hear how much you leave of the idea

of revelation. It has been my joy and comfort in reading the Bible to believe that here I have, pure and unalloyed, the utterance of God to man. But modern critical commentaries ignore any such Divine prompting and deal with nothing but the workings of the human mind. Do you no longer find the Word of God in the Bible? Has God never revealed Himself?"

"Thank you, father, for suggesting this line of thought. Loss and gain, are, as usual, found together; but I am confident the gain is the greater. For devotional use there is a certain loss in not being able to take all Bible words as the direct words of Almighty God. But is it not also a great relief not to be obliged to take them all as in the same sense inspired? The most old-fashioned and simple-minded Christian has some sort of solvent for those parts of the Bible which are on the face of them least edifying. To us it seems fairest and simplest to judge the lowest, on the one hand by comparison with the highest, and on the other hand in relation to the ideas and surroundings, of the authors. May I use an illustration? Do you remember that telegram you sent me the other day about my coming home?"

"Yes, I remember it quite well."

"I never told you, but that telegram gave me quite a shock. I could not understand it, as long as I rested satisfied with the message as being for certain the exact expression of your mind. Then I noticed that it was not signed, and guessed that you had told the coachman to wire a message you had given him verbally. Next I remembered that the operators sometimes make mistakes. Presently I made out what it was you must have meant. By analogy it is really a relief, on the whole, to be set free to work through any outer husk of passing opinion or personal error to the inner kernel of the Divine impulse at the back of the words."

“ But if you once give up the plain meaning as the Divinely intended one, what guarantee have you that you can improve upon it ? ”

“ None, but our faith in the guidance of the Spirit of truth, and here is where we contend that the Higher Criticism helps faith, while the traditional view, held narrowly, might stifle it. The inspiration of Bible words is often so sharply marked off from any enlightenment the Spirit now gives to the Church, that we latter-day Christians are put in a position of conspicuous inferiority to those of an earlier day. We claim that, however unworthily we may use the gift, the Spirit of truth is given still, that men may still reckon upon having ‘ the mind of Christ,’ and ‘ an unction from the Holy One ’ to know all things that we need to know.”

“ Taking, then, the Old Testament, what part of it should you say is least affected in its value by the Higher Criticism ? ”

“ I should say, certainly, the Psalms.”

“ But surely the old view that many, if not most, of the Psalms were by David is ruthlessly assailed by critics ? ”

“ Most certainly that is the case. If there are still cautious men who hesitate to say that we possess no Psalms written by David, even moderate critics are prepared to admit that it is impossible to establish the Davidic authorship of a single Psalm. A pious opinion may be left, but no more. But I would urge that the Psalms only stand out in their true light as the crowning glory of Hebrew religion when they are no longer mainly ascribed to a person or an age whose experience they transcend at so many points. More than that, I would go so far as to say that no one who values the Psalms aright ought to be seriously disturbed about any critical verdict upon the Old Testament. If the religion of the Psalmists is not a genuine experience, if these songs of Zion do not spring from hearts made bright and strong by a real and trustworthy revelation of God, then there is no

God, and religion is always and everywhere an empty dream. But if the contrary be true, if, as Dean Church's *Advent Lectures* and his *Discipline of the Christian Character*, or Mr. Prothero's *Psalms in Human Life*,¹ prove, the Psalms have sounded deep notes of spiritual truth, which have rung true right down the ages, then we have in them far more than the exceptional flights of an elect soul,—they are the seal of the development of the Hebrew spirit. That which culminated in the religion of the Psalms must itself have been a Divine process. We may have to let our notions about the nature of that process and the order of its stages be turned upside down ; but only the God of the spirits of all flesh could have led His creatures up to that level of reverent communion and affectionate intimacy of knowledge.”

“ Thank you, my son. That is a happy suggestion of the Psalter as a meeting point of agreement. I may not follow you as to the late date of the Psalms, but I see that, to a reverent mind they must consecrate the whole history of which they are the finest flower. But what you have put so well does nothing to heal the hurt done by criticism to other parts of the Bible. For example, if the prophets were more often wrong than right, and when they were right were never wholly right, is not a large part of their value for faith destroyed ? ”

“ I do not think so. The mere fact of correct prediction is, in the Old Testament itself, discounted as not a sure test of inspiration. But it is not correct to say that criticism disproves the predictive element in prophecy. The striking article on Prophecy in the *Encyclopedia Biblica* makes full room for a large element of Divine foresight as granted to

¹ Mr Prothero traces 511 allusions to passages in 136 Psalms as having proved their power to speak to the heart, the witnesses being mainly persons with names well known in history.

the Hebrew prophets. What criticism does is to display the prophets as firmly rooted in the soil of the national life, bearing fruit which is closely conditioned by the needs and circumstances of their time. In days when the doctrine of a future life had not yet begun to shed a light on man's path for Israelite believers, the eternal purposes of God could only find clothing in speech under the forms of the time. So in interpreting the prophets we no longer anxiously scan their oracles and visions, as though they contained a cryptic map of universal history, but we lovingly trace in their rough and fragmentary sketches of Divine things the truths God should later flash forth in their unity in Christ."

"I will not delay over the prophets. I must confess that in much of the discussions carried on about the fulfilment of prophecy I can see little more than solemn trifling, and find nothing to help. But perhaps it is the historical contents of the Old Testament which suffer most from what I am inclined still to call the assaults of criticism. If mythical and legendary material abounds, if divergent and even contradictory representations of the same events are to be found scattered freely over the historical works, if whole books like Joshua and Chronicles are declared to be the merest falsification, euphemistically termed idealization of history, what value does all this amalgam retain?"

"To your question, father, it is not easy to give a short answer. But the result is not really so disconcerting as it seems. In the first place, even if in any story we can no longer think that we have a precise narrative of objective fact, yet we have, what may be even more valuable, a reflection of the author's time. An author writes what he takes interest in himself, and what will interest his readers. If certain institutions of his own time were regarded as Mosaic or Davidic, and the existing narratives did not duly describe them, there were writers who, apparently without a prick

of self-reproach, were prepared to re-write the records. In the Priest's Code this was done for the age of Moses, and the Chronicler carried the principle out for the later periods."

"But truth is truth, my son, and a lie is a lie, and the end will not justify the means. Surely, here there is all loss and no gain."

"I still think not. Is it not a considerable relief, in connexion with the trivial details of sacrificial ceremony, to be able to interpret the formula, 'and the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto Aaron and say,' in a less rigid sense than the words at first imply? But there are two other remarks I should like to make about the histories. The first is, that the main outlines of the history of Israel are now so far settled that we can feel a new confidence in using them as a basis for a reconstruction of the course of religious development. The second is, that truth of edification is not the same as truth of history. Shakespeare may convey a truer picture of history than many a Dryasdust annalist, and Scott's novels, for all their anachronisms, may better call out the historical sense than the most up-to-date copier of MSS. We may never be able to prove that the narratives of the patriarchs are biographies of actual individuals, who lived at the indicated times and places; but no one can ever disprove the moral power and spiritual truth of those precious lesson stories for our children."

"Again I cannot say that I am convinced, but it interests me deeply to see how you have found means by which the Old Testament retains its place as a book of Divine inspiration. But what about the New Testament? I tremble to think what will happen if these ideas are transferred from the Old to the New Testament. Yet I have seen quoted judgments about the Gospels which would seem to leave us without a foothold of solid ground in the quicksand of discredited tradition. I fear not for myself, for I know whom

I have believed, but I cannot but fear for those who only know after the flesh.”

“To the New Testament, my dear father, I turn, but without fear. If we can never doubt that bread nourishes, whatever changes of opinion analytical chemists may go through as to its composition, so those who have been brought up in such a home as yours can never doubt that the New Testament is rich in truth to feed man’s spirit, or believe that its writers were all wrong about the Lord of love, whose spirit burned so brightly within them.”

“What then do you make of the confident assertions of the untrustworthiness of the Gospels ? ”

“I would reply that every year it is becoming harder to differ from the verdict upon Christ which is expressed in the earliest writings of the New Testament, the Epistles of St. Paul. There stands his witness, all the stronger because unquestioned. The matters on which men differed then, the validity of the law, the need of circumcision, we are all agreed about. The matters about which doubt is threatened with us, the supremacy and Divine nature of Jesus, and the worth and necessity of the atonement, were accepted as beyond controversy.”

“But about the historical truth of the incidents, and the accuracy of the reports of the words, what can you say ? ”

“There, too, a sense of security is coming back into the minds of students. The peculiarities of the Marcan tradition, and the very awkwardness of the setting of many of the words of Jesus, convey an irresistible impression of substantial trustworthiness. Whether legend has been here and there at work, heightening the miraculous, or multiplying miracles, is a question men will probably feel at liberty to differ about. But the Christ shines out clearer than ever. We may not be sure whether the old man himself or a younger friend wrote down the recollections of the beloved

disciple in the Fourth Gospel, and we may think that, by accident or intention, the light of present experience has made explicit much that in the days of discipleship, times of ignorance as they might be called, had been hidden ; yet in Wales plain people have been proving that it was by no empty figures of speech that the Master was called the world's Bread, and its Light, Door and Shepherd, the Resurrection of the Dying, the True Vine, Man's Supreme Way, the Living Truth, the True Life. The book was to prove to its readers that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and still, as we read, that purpose is fulfilled."

"Thank you for your filial frankness, my son. You will not expect your old father to accept your point of view at his time of life. I have lived long enough to see that things are not so simple as I once believed them to be. I no longer attach quite the same importance to verbal agreement in matters of religion ; and I cannot expect that views like yours, deliberately adopted and reasonably expressed, will be hastily abandoned. But I come now to the last, and, I will confess, the gravest cause for my anxiety for you. I fear lest the critical temper and attitude may unduly occupy your mind, and that the devotional side of religion may be by comparison neglected. Tell me, have you not found that critical studies and conclusions have hindered prayer and interfered with that meditative study of Holy Scripture which alone can unlock its deepest treasures ? "

"Yes, I am afraid that is true. But I do not see that the abuse of the thing is to be made an argument against its use. And perhaps those who have suffered in this way have not been altogether to blame. We have again and again been chilled and put off by being made to see that we were looked on as heretics, and as out of place in devotional gatherings."

"That may partly be true. But I very much trust that

you will allow nothing to obscure the *primary* importance of the grand old simplicities in which we are agreed. We must have another talk another day. I should like to hear how you think this change of view about the Bible is going to affect the practical work of the Church. Let us now just bare our hearts before the God of the Bible and ask Him once more for a fuller gift of that Spirit of whom you spoke so reverently and hopefully just now."

And so with prayer the colloquy broke up.

GEORGE HARFORD.

TARSUS.¹

I. INTRODUCTION.

IN the introductory verses of his Letter to the Galatians—that wonderful preface to the most remarkable letter that ever was written—St. Paul gives an historical sketch of his own life, as he looked back on it with the experience of a lifetime and the insight of a thoroughly reasoned religion to direct and intensify his vision. He describes the chief stages in his life from its beginning: what had been misguided and ignorant almost sinks out of view. He remembers only the steps by which his knowledge of truth and his insight into the real nature of the world had grown. The many years in which he had been a leader and chief among the Jews, with his mind shut up within the circle of Jewish ideas and aspirations, are summed up in a brief sentence; and he passes on to the epoch-making event in his career, the real beginning of his life, “when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother’s womb, and called me through His grace to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.”

It is a widely spread view that in these words the Apostle is merely expressing the infinite power with which God chooses His instruments where He will, selecting persons

¹ I take this opportunity of adding a note about the use of the name *Mirus* (“Wonderful”) among the Christians of Lycaonia. My wife points out the evident reference to Isaiah ix 6: “—His name shall be called Wonderful.” The most remarkable fact in this connexion is the employment of the Latin word rather than the Greek. It cannot be supposed that the Lycaonian Christians used a Latin text of Isaiah; and, in fact, none of the Latin texts use the adjective *mirus*, but *admirabilis*. But in the Colonia Iconium a certain affectation of speaking Latin was fashionable, as inscriptions show; and the people, therefore, preferred to translate the Greek adjective *θαυμαστός* into Latin, and thus they made the name *Mirus* the commonest Christian personal name in the region around, and under the influence of, Iconium (except or along with Paulus).

even the most unlikely and apparently unprepared and unsuited to be His ministers, and putting into them the power to execute His will. But such an interpretation is inadequate and far from complete. It is true that here, as everywhere, Paul lays the strongest emphasis on the limitless power with which God chooses His agents and instruments ; but neither here nor anywhere else does He represent this power as being used in an arbitrary fashion, of which man cannot understand the reasons or the method. The choice of himself was the final execution of a design which had been long maturing in the purpose of God, and which was worked out step by step in the process of events.

Already before his birth Paul had been chosen and set apart as the Apostle of the Gentiles ; and when the proper moment had arrived, the revelation took place, and the design of God was made consciously present in the mind and heart of the man. It was not a sudden and incalculable choice of a human instrument. It was the consummation of a process of choice and preparation which had begun before the man was born, but of which he had previously been wholly unconscious—so unconscious that he had spent his energy in fighting vainly against its compelling power. Only in later time, as he reviewed his life, he could see the preparatory stages in the process, beginning before his birth ; the purpose of God had matured its design by the selection through a long period of means useful to the ultimate end.

If we attempt to interpret this mystic religious statement in the language of history, it means that the family, the surroundings, and the education of Paul had been selected with the perfection of a Divine purpose to make him fit to be what he was designed to be, the Apostle of the Gentiles. There was one nation, one family and one city, out of which the Apostle must arise. The nation was the Jewish ; but

the family was not Palestinian, it was Tarsian. Only "a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews" ¹ could be the Apostle of the perfected Judaic faith; but he must be born and brought up in childhood among the Gentiles, a citizen of a Gentile city, and a member of that conquering aristocracy of Romans which ruled all the cities of the Mediterranean world. The Apostle to the Gentiles must be a Jew, a Tarsian citizen, and at the same time a Roman. If that be not the meaning of Paul's words, the historian may abandon the task of interpreting his words altogether, for they cease to have any historical application whatsoever. But his words, here and everywhere, are instinct and alive with historical force. Every sentence is a summary of historical development. But Paul sees and speaks on the plane of eternal truth; and the historian has to render his words, only half seeing, half understanding them, "with stammering lips and insufficient sound," into those which may describe the steps of that development as they are conditioned by time in the process of history.

Tarsus was the city which should produce the Apostle to the Gentiles. Why was that city chosen? Again we must recognize that the choice was no arbitrary selection of an unlikely and unsuitable place. Tarsus was, by its nature and circumstances, the one suitable place. That it was the one suitable place has been borne in on the present writer in the course of long study of the conditions of society and geographical environment of the Cilician land and cities. It was only after the observation of this remarkable adaptation had gradually fixed itself in his mind, taken root there, and grown into definite expression in a sentence, that he found the same thought fully expressed in the words of

¹ The true meaning of the phrase in Phil. iii. 5 is quite certain (*St. Paul the Trav.* p. 32), though I do not know that any of the commentators have accepted it.

Paul himself. When writing the *Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, those words were passed by unnoticed and unexplained, because they were (like many others still) uncomprehended and obscure. Now they appear full of light and historical meaning.

Now wherein lay the peculiar suitability of Tarsus to educate and mould the mind of him who should in due time make the religion of the Jewish race intelligible to the Graeco-Roman world, and should be able to raise that world up to the moral level of the Hebrew people and the spiritual level of ability to sympathize with the Hebrew religion in its perfected stage? It lay in the fact that Tarsus was the city whose institutions best and most completely united the oriental and the western character. When Greece went forth under Alexander the Great to conquer the East, the union of oriental and occidental was attempted in every city of western Asia. That is the most remarkable and interesting feature of Hellenistic history in the Graeco-Asiatic kingdoms and cities.¹ But none of those cities, though all were deeply affected in varying degrees by their Asiatic surroundings and the Asiatic element in their populations, seem to have been so successful as Tarsus in establishing a fairly harmonious balance between the two elements. Not that the union was perfect: that was impossible so long as the religions of the two elements were inharmonious and mutually hostile. But the Tarsian state was more successful than any other of the great cities of that time in producing an amalgamated society, in which the oriental and the occidental spirit in unison attained in some degree to a higher plane of thought and action. In others the Greek spirit at first was too strong, too "anti-Semitic," and too determined to be

¹ Preface to *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, with chapters xi., xii.

supreme and to crush out all opposition. In Tarsus the Greek qualities and powers were used and guided by a society which was, on the whole, more Asiatic in character.

With this idea in our mind, we proceed to study the character and the social conditions of the city of Tarsus. It would be vain and profitless to study the city simply as it was in the childhood of Paul. We can understand its character and influence at that period only by studying its development and the law of its growth. How had it been formed into its condition at the Christian era? What elements were there in its population? What fortunes had befallen the people and moulded them already before their birth? What influences of sea and air, of plain and mountain, of intercourse and warfare with others, had affected through many generations their nature and determined their character?

It is plain that we are far from regarding the character of Paul as being that of the pure Jew unaffected by Hellenism or Roman experience (i.e. as Roman administration of a province and a city showed Roman system and nature). We can only regret to find in Professor Harnack's recent *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums*, p. 354, what seems intended for a strong assertion of the absolutely contradictory point of view. It may be quoted in Dr. Moffat's translation, ii. p. 137, "If there are any lingering doubts in the mind as to whether the Apostle should be credited, in the last instance, to Jewish instead of to Hellenistic Christianity, these doubts may be laid to rest by a study of Porphyry. For this critic, a Hellenist of the first water, feels keener antipathy to Paul than to any other Christian. Paul's dialectic is totally unintelligible to him, and he therefore deems it both sophistical and deceitful. Paul's proofs resolve themselves for him into flat contradictions, whilst in the Apostle's personal testimonies he sees merely an un-

stable, barbarian and insincere rhetorician, who is a foe to all noble and liberal culture.”

Setting aside the ultimate and apparently irreconcilable difference between Professor Harnack's point of view in reading Paul himself and that which is taken in this study, which is too large a topic and too far from the proper subject of these pages, we must remark that the peculiarly intense antipathy of the Hellenist Porphyry to Paul does not in the slightest degree prove Professor Harnack's view that Paul was untouched by Hellenism. Tacitus's principle, *odia fratrum inimicissima*, the bitterest hatred is that which intervenes between brothers, is as true in regard to philosophic or religious thought as in respect of human life and passions. Porphyry hated Paul, not because he was the purest and most unalloyed Jew, but because he was the Jew who ought to have been more truly Hellenist than he actually was, who had quaffed from the fountain of Hellenism and then rejected all the essential features of Hellenic thought, who had learned from Hellenism in order to destroy it, who used Hellenistic ideas and abused them in unreasonable and unnatural ways, who had got hold of such Hellenic terms as “grace” (the most characteristic word and thought in the whole range of Hellenism), and used it in a hatefully sophistical and deceitful way like the treacherous barbarian that he was. Nowhere could there be found, in Porphyry's estimation, a more detestable and dangerous foe to all noble and liberal culture than the de-Hellenized Hellenist Paul.

As the purpose of these papers is to study the growth of Tarsus from the point of view above indicated, facts and events will be treated and grouped according to their importance as affecting the growth of the city. It will be convenient here, once for all, to mention various articles in which the writer has studied Tarsus from other points of

view. In an article, "Cilicia, Tarsus, and the great Taurus Pass,"¹ there is given a study in considerable detail of the geographical and commercial conditions which helped to determine the history of the three cities of the lower Cilician plain. Two papers in the *Athenaeum*, December 6, 1902, and August 1, 1903, contain a description of the situation and surroundings of Tarsus, and of the topography of the district. A paper in which the attempt was made to estimate the importance of the relations between sea valley and central plateau, and to classify "the geographical conditions determining history and religion in Asia Minor," bears on the history of Tarsus² among other places. The article "Tarsus" in Dr. Hastings' great *Dictionary of the Bible*, gives a summary of the history of Tarsus. I have also written a detailed study of Mallos, the great rival of Tarsus, but refrained from printing it until the opportunity of visiting Mallos may present itself, so that the topographical view expressed in it (which is quite opposed to the opinions, differing from one another, recently advocated by M. Imhoof Blumer and by Messrs. Heberdey and Wilhelm), may be tested by actual experiment; but in the present series of studies the truth of the view advocated in this unpublished paper must be assumed. Mallos is however mentioned here only incidentally—in so far as it affected the history of its great rival Tarsus.

II. THE SITUATION OF TARSUS.

Tarsus (which still bears its ancient name slightly modified, Tersous) is situated in the Cilician plain, about 70 to 80 feet above sea level, and about ten miles from the

¹ *Geographical Journal*, October, 1903, pp. 357-413. We visited Tarsus in 1891 and in 1902. In 1890 also I passed through it, without stopping, when hurrying to catch a steamer at Mersina, the modern port of Tarsus.

² *Geographical Journal*, September, 1902, pp. 257-282.

southern coast. Behind it, about two miles distant, the hills begin to rise gently from the level plain; and they extend back in undulating and gently swelling ridges, intersected by deep water channels, until they lean against the vast and lofty ridge of Taurus, about thirty miles distant to the north.

Cilicia lies between Taurus and the sea, and it consists of the level sea plain, the alluvial hills, and the front of the ridge of Taurus. The bounds on the north varied in different periods of history. In the Roman time (with which we are here chiefly concerned) they were fixed high up on the face of Taurus, though not quite so high as the summit of the front ridge; and, as this is the natural geographical boundary between the Cilician land, steamy with the moist heat of its well watered soil, and the broad, lofty and inclement mountain region of Taurus, backed by the high central plateau of Anatolia, we shall regard it as the true frontier of the country. The exact point is indicated by inscriptions on the rock walls of the narrow pass called the "Cilician Gates."

The combination of these three kinds of country was highly advantageous to the Cilician cities and people. The cities, Tarsus and the rest, were situated in the low plains, only a few feet above sea level. The moist heat of the fertile soil and oppressive atmosphere would have been unfavourable to vigorous municipal or commercial life. But the considerable extent of undulating ground, often very fertile and at the present time generally well wooded, which intervened as foot hills between the sea plain and the Taurus mountains, offered a far more pleasant and healthy abode during the summer heat; while the high glens and plateaus of Taurus were admirable sanatoria.

Those foot hills, therefore, were a valuable part of Tarsian territory, and really essential to its prosperity;

and the remains of ancient life show that the opportunity was thoroughly used by the people. There is, in truth, a second Tarsus on the hills, about nine to twelve miles north of the city proper, probably a town chiefly for summer residence, but still a large and strong town with regular fortifications on a great scale, permanently occupied by a considerable population—indeed a much stronger city than Tarsus on the level plain, devoid of any proper acropolis (as Dion Chrysostom mentions), could ever have been.

As one wanders over these ruins, which extend westwards from the north road for several miles up to the deep gorge of the river Cydnus, the question even suggests itself whether this was not a separate city; and the name of Augusta, a Cilician city whose site and even neighbourhood are entirely uncertain, rises to one's mind. But it is beyond doubt that the territory of Tarsus extended up to the Cilician frontier at the Gates, for the "Bounds of the Cilicians" are mentioned on the coins of the city; and therefore this hill town must have been in Tarsian territory. The ruins are evidently mainly Roman; and the very name which was given to them in the second or third century can probably be determined. On the west edge of the ruins the Roman road from the Cilician Gates to Tarsus is spanned by a triumphal arch, on which doubtless once stood a triumphal car drawn by four horses, in bronze or marble (*quadrigae*). This monument gave its name to the whole district around; and the name appears in Greek as Kodrigai on coins of Tarsus, struck about A.D. 200. From these coins we learn that games of the Olympian fashion were celebrated in honour of the victory of the Emperor Severus (over Pesceunius Niger in A.D. 194) at Kodrigai, which is called the "Boundary of the Cilicians," and was therefore on the north side of Tarsus towards the Cilician Gates. Severus had marched south

into Cilicia along the road from the Gates, and we may presume that the triumphal arch was erected at the place where the road approached the town.¹ On the plateau near the arch games might well have been held, especially during the heat of summer.

This upper town formed a really important factor in Tarsian history. It was mainly instrumental in maintaining unimpaired through many centuries the vigour and energy of the citizens. Tarsus, lying low in the plain, sheltered by Taurus from the invigorating northerly breezes, which are so important in maintaining the salubrity of Anatolia, would inevitably be a relaxing and enervating place; but the close neighbourhood of the hills brought an invigorating residence within easy reach of the mass of the population.

The healthy condition of ancient Greek cities generally was due partly to the water supply, partly to the cleanliness which was a matter of religious duty, enforced by the gods of the streets, whose images stood there to enforce respect, and partly to the love of the people for country residence and for outdoor life. That, in choosing the sites of the great Greek cities of Asia, much attention was paid to the character of the atmosphere and the neighbourhood of invigorating high ground, is evident to all who have seen and noted their situation.

The population of the entire country is, and has always probably been, appreciative of this character. The natives even now, unobservant and resigned and careless as they are, will often distinguish between the invigorating atmo-

¹ A friend who is studying the triumphal arches of the Romans tells me that he believes the arch to be older than the time of Severus. Trajan, Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius had all probably visited Tarsus; and the arch might have been built to honour any of them (especially Hadrian or Marcus).

sphere of one town and the oppressive, heavy air of another at no great distance in a worse situation.

The case of Tarsus was similar to that of Perga, and even worse : Perga stood on a slightly elevated plateau by the river : Tarsus lay on the dead level plain, only a few feet above the lowest level of the river Cydnus, and exposed to inundation as soon as the water rose in flood. Both are sheltered in the same way by the northern mountains ; both face the sea and the sun. In my *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 62 f., this character of Perga is described. A distinguished French scholar has denied the truth of this account of Perga, on the ground that the thorough cultivation of the soil in ancient times must have made it healthy. It is all a question of degree. Cultivation will do much to diminish the malarious character of a district ; but the soil was so fertile because it is naturally abundantly moist. Irrigation, where needed, is easy. Wherever this abundant moisture and fertility characterize the sea plain in this extremely hot country, fever is prevalent and the climate is depressing, while insect pests make human life trying and miserable for a considerable part of the year. The bad effect is immensely increased by neglect and the increase of marshes ; but it is unavoidable and incurable.

Now since the country south of Tarsus has been allowed to relapse into its primitive state of marsh, the climate of the city is doubtless more oppressive and enervating than it was in the Roman time, when the marshes had all been drained and the country was entirely under cultivation. But, at the best, the situation of Tarsus must always have made the climate relaxing ; and the city could not have retained the vigour that made its citizens widely famous in the ancient world, without the hill town or hill residence so close at hand, which prevented the degeneration of the Tarsian spirit through many centuries.

But this hill town was not a mere place of summer residence. It seems to have grown from a mere *mansio in monte* (as it is perhaps called in the Peutinger Table), into a real fortified city, a second Tarsus. The fortifications were probably constructed during the decay of the Roman Empire, when invasions were a constant danger, and a stronger defence than the city of the plain was required. It seems possible that this hill town is the Tarsus which the Bordeaux Pilgrim mentions, xxiv. Roman miles south of the Cilician Gates. This is far too short for the distance between the Gates and the city of the plain. It is quite probable that the Pilgrim stopped at the hill town, and gave his measurement of distance correctly.¹

Tarsus was certainly a very large city in the Roman times. The information of intelligent and observant residents is that, wherever you dig, from the hills two miles north of the present city to the lake and marsh five or six miles south, you come upon remains of the ancient city. With the residents on the hills, the population of the Tarsian State is likely to have been not much less than a million. Thus it was, as Basil describes it, a metropolis for three provinces, a centre of communication for Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Assyria.

The fortunes and history of Tarsus were determined by three geographical conditions : (1) its relation to the rest of the Cilician plain, (2) its connexion through the river Cydnus with the sea, and (3) its position commanding the end of the principal pass across the Taurus mountains to the central plateau and the western and northern parts of Anatolia, one of the greatest routes which have made the history of the Mediterranean world, the pass of the Cilician Gates.

¹ The only alternative to this hypothesis is to alter the text and say that xii. is an error for xxii. or xxiv.

III. TARSUS AND THE PLAIN OF CILICIA.

The country of Cilicia is, roughly speaking, triangular in shape, the apex on the north-east being formed by its mighty boundary mountains, Amanus, running due south and separating Cilicia from Syria and Commagene, and Taurus diverging to the south-west and dividing the country from Cappadocia and Lycaonia. Those two great mountain walls approach close to the sea, which forms the third side of the Cilician triangle.

We may neglect as unimportant two narrow strips of coast land, at the eastern and western ends of Cilicia, the one where Amanus and its spur Djebel-Nur surround the Gulf of Issus, the other where Taurus and its foot hills run down close to the coast. Apart from these strips of territory and the foot hills that lie against the mountains and make a full half of the whole land, Cilicia consists of two very rich plains, the upper or eastern, which is divided from the sea by a ridge of hills (Djebel-Nur), and the lower or western, which is in the strictest sense a maritime plain. The eastern plain is the valley of the river Pyramus. The western is the valley of three rivers, the lowest course of the Pyramus, the Sarus, and the Cydnus; and on the three rivers were situated the three great cities, Mallos on the Pyramus, Adana on the Sarus, and Tarsus on the Cydnus. The mutual relations and rivalries of these three cities have determined the history of the maritime plain of Cilicia.

Another side of Cilician life, the opposition between the western plain with its capital Tarsus and the eastern plain with its capital Anazarba, will not concern us much in the present study. It was an important feature of the later Roman period, the second and following centuries after Christ; but it exercised no appreciable influence in determining the character of the Pauline Tarsus, with which we are now engaged.

The west Cilician plain has been gradually won from the sea in the course of ages. It has been formed mainly by the great river Sarus, which bears through the centre of the plain to the sea the united waters of two great rivers of the plateau, the Karmalas and the Sarus proper. The formation of the plain has probably been assisted by several successive slight elevations of the level of the land (shown by a succession of old sea beaches, which mark out the shape of the former gulf, now become the western plain); but, mainly, the plain has been deposited by the Sarus. This plain, like the country as a whole, is triangular in shape, with the sea as its base, and its apex in a recess of the hills. It contains about 800 square miles of arable land, with a strip of sand hills and lagoons about two to three miles wide along the coast.

At the apex of the plain, on the north, the river Sarus enters this lower plain, and winds its circuitous way in a great sweep towards the sea, which it now reaches very near the mouth of the Cydnus at the western edge of the plain. At an early period it probably joined the Pyramus, which, entering the western plain by a narrow pass between the Taurus foot hills and the Djebel-Nur, keeps close at the present day to the base of the latter, and winds back towards the sea, on the extreme eastern limit of the plain.¹ But the Sarus deserted that old junction some centuries before the time of Christ, and formed its own way to the sea through the centre of the plain. It probably found entrance to the sea at different points as the centuries passed by, and its mouth is now, certainly, much further west than it was in the Pauline period. At that time it apparently flowed not directly into the sea, but into a large lagoon, still well

¹ The Pyramus formerly joined the sea further to the west, as will be described below.

marked, about nine miles east of the mouth of the Cydnus and fifteen miles west of the old Pyramus-mouth. This lagoon was half divided from the sea by a bar of sand. Thus the Sarus had no navigable entrance from the sea ; and a city situated on the river Sarus could have no direct maritime connexion. Adana, therefore, the city on the Sarus, was situated far up the river, near the apex of the plain. The river was and is there quite navigable, but navigation must have been only for purposes of local communication, not of sea-going traffic.

Taking into consideration the foot hills as well as the sea plain, we see that Adana lies near the centre of Cilicia, in a very favourable situation for ruling the country, when sea navigation is unimportant. Hence it is the natural capital of the country under Turkish rule. A lofty rocky hill forms an excellent and strong acropolis, crowned now by the buildings of the American Mission. From those buildings there is offered a wonderful view ; on the south, across the apparently limitless level plain, the sea cannot be distinguished ; on the north and west one looks over the lower foot hills to the long snow-clad wall of Taurus. Eastwards the view is almost more varied and impressive.

From Tarsus no such view can be got ; the city is so near the foot hills that the Taurus wall is concealed from view behind them ; and there is no hill marked enough to serve as an acropolis or to afford a good outlook. But from the hills a few miles northward, and especially from the acropolis of the hill city, a marvellous view is presented, extending along the mountain walls of Taurus and of Amanus, and across the Gulf of Issus to the Syrian mountains and the promontory behind which lie Seleucia and Antioch.

Adana and Tarsus are cities of inevitable importance ; and both retain their ancient names to the present day. Mallos, on the Pyramus, has lost its people and its name.

Its very site is still unsettled and a subject of controversy. It owed its greatness in early history to circumstances that have long ceased to exist. At the beginning of history it stands forth as the principal harbour of the Cilician land, and the chief seat of Greek influence and trade. The Pyramus, then, offered the only well defined river entrance on the Cilician coast with a natural harbour, whereas Tarsus had to make its harbour, and Adana never could have enjoyed maritime communication.

As was necessary in primitive times, when piracy was a never-ceasing danger, Mallos was built, not on the sea, but some way up the river. Strabo mentions that it stood on a hill, and thus points out its position, for there is only one hill near the mouth of the Pyramus. West of the ancient mouth a little ridge of hills (now called Kara-Tash)¹ rises on the seashore. This ridge was probably once an island in the Cilician Gulf, and afterwards it formed the eastern promontory at the entrance to the gulf. As the land rose and the sea receded, the Pyramus passed out along its northern and western base into the sea. The city of Mallos was situated on the northern slope of the hill, away from the sea and looking towards the river. In this situation, one understands why Scylax regards it as an inland city, up the river, while both Strabo and the Stadiasmus describe it as belonging to the coast, and Strabo pointedly contrasts it with the inner country.

The river Pyramus, like the Sarus, has silted up its former mouth, and now flows in a different channel. About twelve or fifteen miles above the ancient mouth, where the old course turned off towards south-west, keeping close along the northern edge of the Mallos hills, it now bends

¹ Kara-Tash, Black-Stone, is the name both of the hills and of a village situated on them.

sharply back to the east and flows into the bay of Ayash (the ancient Aigeai), which it is rapidly filling up with the soil deposited from its waters. Accordingly the site of Mallos must now be looked for on the western side of the modern river, and at some considerable distance from the bank.

Between the rivers Cydnus and Pyramus lies the famous Aléian plain, deposited in large degree by the river Sarus, which flows through it and has gradually formed it. A plain formed in this way must in an earlier stage of history have been a succession of swamps and waste land, only half won from the sea, with the Sarus struggling to find a painful and devious way through it. Long after the Pyramus had found a well defined channel down past the site of Mallos to the coast, the Sarus was wending its difficult course through those marshy lowlands towards the sea. Homer has preserved for us in the fifth book of the *Iliad* the memory of that early time, when he relates the tale of Bellerophon, how

When at last, forsaken in his mind,
Forsook of Heaven, forsaking humankind,
Wide o'er the Aléian plain he chose to stray,
A long forlorn uncomfortable way.

This writer evidently understood the Aléian plain to be a melancholy waste, untraversed by any path, uninhabited by man, a scar upon the smiling face of the land, where a melancholic madman might "wander alone, eating his own soul, avoiding the paths of man."¹ But in the classical

¹ So also Alemaeon, when struck with madness after he had slain his mother, could find no rest or peace or home, until he went to a place which was neither sea nor land. Such a place he found in the swampy delta of the Achelôos. Bellerophon, afflicted also with madness by the Divine wrath, found his lonely refuge in the marsh land of the lower Sarus. I am indebted to Miss J. E. Harrison, LL.D., for the illustration.

period of history it was a great stretch of especially fertile and rich land. Strabo distinguishes the Aléian plain from the coast-land, because the former was cultivated and rich, while the latter was mere sand and lagoon and cane-brake. The troops of Alexander the Great were able to march right across the plain, which was well suited for the movement of cavalry in the fourth century before Christ and doubtless during many centuries earlier. The Homeric account preserves a true tale of ancient days, brought to the harbours of the west by the early Greek sailors who traded to the port of Mallos, and the tale probably carries us back to a time not later than the ninth century B.C., and opens before us a page in the history of the gradual formation of the central Cilician river and the Cilician plain. How far human agency co-operated with nature in defining and embanking the river channel is a question on which proper exploration would doubtless throw some light. Those great engineering operations by which rivers were regulated and marshes were drained, as e.g. the Yang-tse-kiang, the Po, the Nile, the Boeotian marsh Copais, and many mountain glens in Greece and Anatolia, lie far back at the beginning of civilization in the southern countries.

The Aléian plain was divided between the three great cities ; but undoubtedly the largest part belonged to Mallos. Hence Mallos is probably the harbour which is meant by Herodotus, vi. 95, when he tells that the great army sent by Darius against Greece in 490 B.C. marched to the Aléian plain in Cilicia and encamped there, until the ships arrived and took them on board.

The early history of Tarsus was determined by competition with its two rivals. It outstripped them in the race at last ; but Mallos was at first the great harbour and the principal Greek colony of Cilicia. An alliance between Mallos and Adana was natural, because the path from

Mallos to the north and the inner plateau lay through Adana, and its trade was dependent on the friendship of the inland city: each had much to gain from friendship with the other. On the other hand the interests of Tarsus were opposed to both Adana and Mallos. Tarsus, as a harbour, competed with the latter, and as commanding its own path to the inner plateau it competed with the former. This struggle for superiority continued through the Greek period, and traces of it remain in the orations which Dion Chrysostom delivered at Tarsus in the beginning of the second century after Christ. But Tarsus grew steadily greater and more powerful, while its two rivals seem to have finally been forced to accept a lower rank, leaving the supremacy of the western plain to their more vigorous competitor.

To judge from the holes which are made in the ground here and there, the plain near Tarsus consists of a stratum of rich fertile soil resting on a bottom of gravel and pebbles. The stratum of soil is thin at the edge of the hills on the north and gets deeper as one goes south towards the sea. The rivers flow on the gravel and pebbles. Perhaps the same kind of formation may extend over the whole Aléian plain.

It is sometimes stated that the ruins of the ancient Tarsus are covered by the silt of the river to the depth of 15 or 20 feet. I could find no proof that any recent river deposit overlies the old level of the city, nor that the remains of ancient life are covered so deep, except on a sort of hill or mound on the south-west of the modern buildings, which seems to be entirely modern, caused by the earth accumulating over ancient remains. Such a mound always tends to gather over an uninhabited site; but in the inhabited part of Tarsus the modern level seems not to be more than a very few feet above the ancient.

This may be inferred from the depth at which the pebble and gravelly bottom is struck in digging, for the level of this bottom has probably not changed, since the overlying stratum of loam was deposited in the geological process of formation. So far as mere command of a large extent of fertile territory is concerned, Tarsus, though well equipped in that respect, was not equal to either of its rivals. Its ultimate superiority was due to other causes.

W. M. RAMSAY.

“THE CHURCH IN THE HOUSE.”

THE present writer has been a reader of the EXPOSITOR for thirty years, and an occasional contributor to its pages for twenty. In the former capacity he trusts it may not be impertinent in him to express the gratitude he feels that religious controversy has been so carefully and tactfully banished from its covers. Possibly some reader glancing at the heading of the present article might fear the introduction of this unhappy feature. It will not be so, although, the pity of it, the moment the word Church or The Church be named, the figure of the spirit of controversy, ugly, ominous, is not very far off, the foe to truth and peace, the ally to passion and prejudice. But if one more tribute may be paid to this periodical it will be that controversy by the nature of the case finds itself shut out. Its one object is the exposition of the Holy Scriptures. Given intelligence, sincerity, and devoutness, given that writers and readers can declare with Huxley, “I hold no opinion which I will not exchange for the Truth,” then controversy has already received its congé. Something still more hopeful remains. Christian people talk about “unhappy divisions,” they make blind and painful efforts after reunion, but reunion remains on the far distant horizon. Bishop Westcott once declared that such reunion need not be a matter of despair if only the teaching of the four Gospels was at once fully known and laid to heart. But there is no need to narrow such teaching to the Evangelic record. Wherever a body of Christian people is found with a passionate and devout love of Holy Scriptures, whenever lives are spent in their study, whenever the linguistic, the critical and historical faculties are dedicated to the service of the Master,—in other words, when sacred study and its fruits are crowned by the work of the

Holy Spirit of God, then in such a body or bodies will be found a harmony half conscious, but ringing true, like the music of the spheres.

Controversy is on occasion a necessary evil. When such a melancholy crisis arises, then the only fit controversialist is the man who hates the controversial spirit. Such a man was our own Richard Hooker. Students of the Fifth Book of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* will remember how he proposes to deal with the question of the Eucharist, an issue upon which controversy was at least as acute in his day as in the present. He entreats with a pathetic insistence that his readers shall drop all contention as to how Christ may be there present, and to rest in the happiness of grace therein received. “Take,” says he, “that upon which different bodies in the Church are agreed,” ignore the issue on which they differ.

“Let no other cogitation fill the heart of the communicant but this : O my God, Thou art true ; O my soul, thou art happy.” It was a wish right nobly expressed, but, alas, three hundred years are passed and it awaits fulfilment.

Richard Hooker’s language may not unfittingly be applied to the present subject. Let us see then certain great facts about the title “Church” wherein there is a general agreement among all Christian people. There is the Church visible, militant here on earth ; there is the Church invisible, at rest. If the Church visible is, as again will be accepted by Christians, “The blessed company of all faithful people,” it follows that it is universal, and all-embracing. As St. Paul would assure us in and through Him Who is the Head of the Church there is within it no limitation or separation possible of nationality, of caste, of sex.¹

The primary meaning of the Church according to the New Testament is the great comprehensive company of believers,

¹ Col i. 24.

the Spirit-bearing body,¹ knowing no limit either of time or space, remaining one in one Lord, possessing one Faith, sharing in one sacrament of initiation, or membership, not indeed losing this characteristic and inherent unity because she is seen now and again down the ages to be convulsed with divisions, the schisms which rend her asunder and the heresies which distress her being actual tokens of efforts on the part of the faithful ever being made to preserve and realize her unity.²

This great and comprehensive meaning of the term Church primary in the New Testament is one which it is of the first importance to hold in these days. To throw doubt upon the inherent oneness of the Church is to imperil her true headship by Christ. To throw doubt upon her universal character is to go back to the position of those Judaizers whom the great Apostle of the Gentiles so strictly rebuked. It is indeed difficult to realize these august conceptions because the dust of controversies blurs their outlines; but just as political feuds and parties do not crush out our single national life and Spirit, so neither do our unhappy divisions destroy or obliterate these marks of the Church. The grand conception of her oneness and catholicity survives the attempts to divide the former and to limit the latter. According to the New Testament generally, and to Pauline teaching in particular, the first—the inalienable meaning of the Church is that one and universal body wherein believers recognize and find their communion with their Lord its Head.

There is no contradiction to this primary conception in the fact that there are Churches within the one Church.³ Seven of St. Paul's Epistles are addressed to local Churches, most of which he had himself founded.

¹ Gal. iii. 28.

² 1 Cor. xi. 19.

³ 1 Cor. iv. 17.

Thessalonica,
Colossae,
Ephesus,
Corinth,
Philippi,

and last but not least, Rome, were cities in which the gospel had been preached by the Apostle or his colleagues, and where the new Churches deserved and received St. Paul's tender solicitude in his absence. Galatia, whatever view be taken of its geographical extent, was a country which must anyhow have had four or five Christian settlements. This is also in all probability the case with Ephesus, because the letter to the Ephesians is now generally regarded as a cyclical letter,¹ and not one addressed merely to the converts in the city which worshipped Artemis.

The same geographical sense of the word Church is of course emphasized in the Apocalypse. The message to the President of each of the seven Churches was a written one.² Of these seven, two—Ephesus certainly, and Laodicea probably,³ had been addressed by St. Paul in letters; with the others he was familiar in his travels excepting perhaps Sardis. Companies of Christian converts, whether in a country or city or even village, became local Churches, constituent parts of the Catholic whole, preserving their independence without loss of union, maintaining that union by mutual love and generous service. It may be that it was for the sake of preserving intact the conception of the one Church that St. Paul's normal address at the beginning of his letters is not to the local Church, but rather to the believers that constitute it, under such titles as saints,⁴ faithful,⁵ brethren,⁶ and so forth. The same

¹ Eph. i. 1. B omits *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*.

² Apoc. i. 11.

³ Col. ii. 15, 16.

⁴ Rom. i. 7.

⁵ Eph. i. 1.

⁶ Col. i. 2.

wish may have prompted the Apostle to employ the plural number¹ when referring to the Church of a district or country, although the singular is at times explicitly used. It is enough to say that the New Testament adds to the great primary meaning of the Church another meaning, only narrower because it is applied locally, whether to the Churches of a vast area like Asia Minor or Galatia, to the Churches of great cities like Rome and Corinth or to the Church of a little town like Cenchrea. There remains a third application in the New Testament of the term Church which forms the subject of the present inquiry, viz., the Church in the House. Just as the family is the real unit of Society so the Church in the House is the unit of the Church universal. The narrative of the Acts of the Apostles indicates that Christians first met for common worship in a dwelling-house. The choice of such a centre would be, from the nature of the case in the Apostolic age, limited. The house must be of sufficient size to contain a room large enough to accommodate the Christian community. Such a house would be that of Mary, the mother of John Mark; the room large enough to hold a considerable number of worshippers would, in Jerusalem, be the upper room.² Mary was probably a woman of substance who devoted such a room for the local Christian ecclesia. The situation is not without modern parallels, when women exhibiting the rare conjunction of social distinction with spiritual instincts open their salons for philanthropic or religious gatherings. What Mary did at Jerusalem was doubtless done by Prisca³ at Rome and elsewhere; while her name, coming as it does before that of her husband Aquila, at least indicates that she was the leader in this Christian enterprise. But both may be assumed from the narrative of the Acts as

¹ Gal. i. 3.

² Acts xii. 12.

³ Acts xviii. 2, 26; Rom. xvi. 3, 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

heads of a business firm to have been able to receive in their house the Christian community. A like religious hospitality must have been extended to Laodicea by the otherwise unknown lady, Nympha.¹

To such a list of women—good, if not great—may be added that of Apphia,² specially described as "the sister," and with less certainty the forbears on the female side of Timothy, Lois and Eunice. The Church in their houses would include their family and dependents, while Christian neighbours would also find there a central point for common worship. One may conclude therefore that in great cities such as Ephesus, or Rome, or Corinth there would be several meeting-houses of the kind, and that the credit of arrangement and organization was largely due to women marked off not only by their goodness but by social status. Nor does it seem true to history to regard the Church in the house as a merely temporary expedient. Consecrated buildings do not appear to have come into existence within the area of the Roman Empire before the third century. Meanwhile for some hundred years at least, owing to suspicion on the part of the imperial authorities breaking out from time to time into actual persecutions, the common worship of Christians was confined to the "Church in the House."

At this point recent archaeological investigations both here and in America offer an interesting contribution to the question. It seems unlikely that the upper room which was a peculiarity of Syrian architecture had any relation to the house out of whose form sprang the outline of the earliest Church building.

Professor Lowrie, of Princetown, N.J.,³ has demonstrated that the form of the basilica was not derived from the

¹ Col. iv. 15.

² Philemon 2. The best attested reading.

³ In *Christian Art and Architectures*.

school building, still less from heathen temples, but that its general place was determined by the early custom of worship in the private house. The general characteristics of the basilica exhibit "an oblong rectangular ground plan divided longitudinally into aisles by pillars supporting a wooden roof. Sometimes, though not invariably, there would be a transept, and the basilica would terminate eastward by a circular presbytery or sanctuary surmounted by an apse." All these main features, the Professor holds, are derived from the chief ground chamber, or hall of a large Roman house or villa. Again, the transition from the Church of the house to a consecrated building would be all the simpler from the custom, as may be almost certainly concluded, of the gradual reservation of the large room in the former wholly to sacred purposes; just as in many private houses in England there is felt to be a gain in reverence when a room is specially dedicated for family prayers.

Of the nature of the common worship in the Church in the house it is not the purpose of the present writer to speak. It is enough to say that the celebrating of the Lord's Supper at least on the Sunday must have been its most significant feature.¹ Psalmody,² Hymnody,³ the recitation in its simplest form of a Christian creed (for few students deny its presence in germ in the New Testament), lections from the Old Testament, the recitation of Apostolic letters and commissions,⁴ collections for the poor,⁵ would be the common features of worship. Extempore addresses, and prayers duly regulated by authority⁶ would be given and made. A devout simplicity must have characterized the gathering, and such an unity as only can be experienced when all the worshippers are known to one another. As

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

² Eph. v. 19.

³ Cp. Acts xvi. 25; Col iii. 16.

⁴ Col. iv. 16.

⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

⁶ 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

the little congregation dispersed, often not without fear of insult or attack, it must have experienced more than we can experience in these softer days, the fulfilment of the Lord's promise: "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them."

The "Church in the house" in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age has certainly some lessons for the present. Not only in our Colonies, but in many country districts in our own land, there are places where access to Churches is difficult for the very young, the aged, the infirm. There it would often be a worthy Christian enterprise if well-to-do laymen in the exercise of their just privileges, and without encroachment upon ministerial authority, provided and furnished some oratory, and, as far as it might be, conducted its services. By so doing in many places the lamp of the Faith would burn clearly, if not splendidly, where now it is going out.

Lastly we are told, with a melancholy insistence, recalling the famous utterance of Bishop Butler, of the decay of religion and of prevalent indifference to things spiritual. May this not largely be due to the fact that Religion and the Home are to-day so often strangers? The very title "Church in the house" shows that at the beginning of the Christian era the two were regarded as inseparable. As it is now the fires of the domestic altar are rarely kept burning, and the family life receives no consecration. Not until Christians can make Joshua's bold assertion, "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord," can they expect the choicest blessings of home life, or set a serviceable example to the world around.

B. WHITEFOORD.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

Revue Biblique, July, 1905. Van Hoonacker, commenting upon the text of *Jonah* ii. 6, suggests for הריים the somewhat novel reading הריס, in which he would recognize the Greek ἄδης; he translates accordingly: "I have descended the precipices of Hades." J. Dissard, in the same number, gives an interesting account of the movements of the tribe 'Amr or Banu 'Aqabah in the last century from the neighbourhood of Mecca to South Palestine, and thence to the occupation of the land of Moab. The vivid description of tribal conflicts and clan jealousies, the motives and plan of migrations, and the characteristics of Bedouin life, present a picture which is not without some value for the Old Testament student. The writer remarks that the Arab nomad is neither a mere highwayman nor is he the simple man adorned with all the virtues with which some writers have depicted him. It is difficult for him to adapt himself to the ideas of other peoples, and almost impossible for him to endure foreign domination. Work is not honourable; and if the district where he settles will not suffice for his needs, he seeks other pasturage, to give battle to the weak or to make alliance with the strong. M. Dissard observes further that in the history of this migration religion or religious acts scarcely find a place; the Bedouin of to-day (as he remarks), like his ancestors of the time of Gideon, have no religion. This interesting record is a useful corrective to the not uncommon view that the idealized pictures which Israelite tradition drew of the patriarchal age are literally true representations of Hebrew nomad life. Cp. the valuable remarks of Robertson Smith, in the *English Historical Review*, 1888, p. 129.

A discussion of the oft-debated phrase "a land flowing

with milk and honey," by Dalman and Bauer in the *Mitteil. und Nachrichten d. deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1905, pp. 27 sqq., 65 sqq., has produced much interesting information on the fertility of Palestine both in the past and present; and whilst the former scholar approves of the explanation of a native that the words are a comprehensive phrase for the production of "all things that are sweet and tasteful," the latter argues strenuously for a literal interpretation. It is at least certain, Professor Dalman observes, that the phrase could never have been used from the point of view of (Israelite) immigrants from the desert; the usage points to its having been a customary Palestinian saying. Professor Guthe, in the same journal (p. 49 sqq.) has an interesting investigation of the sacrificial-place at Petra; he discovers the table at which the participants ate the sacrificial meal, and notes that the cult at Petra is reminiscent of Canaanite or Israelite high-places rather than of Arabian ritual.

Zeitschrift f. d. alttest. Wissenschaft, 1905: I. A. Büchler discusses exhaustively the account of the celebration of the Passover, especially in regard to the burnt-offering, in the days of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Chron. xxx. 15, xxxv. 12, 14-16) in the light of the rival views of the schools of Hillel and Shammai, the evidence of the Book of Jubilees and Old Testament post-exilic references. Büchler's study, with its proof of traces of later redaction, should be a stimulus to deeper criticism of the work of the so-called "Chronicler" in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, which, as the Levitical genealogies alone show, cannot be from one hand.

Heft II. Hans Schmidt gives an account of past literary-critical work upon the book of Jonah, with particular attention to Böhme's study in that journal (1887). This

is a supplement to his own theory, which he works out with considerable skill: (I.) It is generally admitted that Jonah's prayer (ch. ii.) may be ignored as a later interpolation due to a hand which missed the words which "Jonah prayed" (*v.* 1). (II.) In ch. iii. two proclamations are unnecessary, and the royal command to clothe man and beast in sackcloth ignores the circumstance that the inhabitants had already attired themselves in mourning garb. Hence *vv.* 6-9 (marked by distinctive linguistic peculiarities) are regarded as an addition to emphasize the penitence of Nineveh. (III.) Further, in ch. i. many inconcinnities are to be found: e.g., *v.* 16 (where the men apparently begin to call upon the Lord) compared with *v.* 14 (where they are already God-fearing); Schmidt suggests that *v.* 13 seq. is an interpolation. Also, he finds it difficult to understand *v.* 5 seq.; and asks, why did Jonah lie down to sleep? The most contradictory explanations have been given. Pointing out the use of different words for "ship" and "storm," he proceeds to argue that traces of a distinct source are to be found in *vv.* 4*a*, 5 (*a* and *c*), 6 . . . 8, 9, 10 (first clause). . . . Since it is unlikely that *v.* 9 can belong to the story of a disobedient prophet, it is conjectured that this source contained an entirely different view, and that the storm was not sent, as the present narrative suggests, on account of Jonah's refusal. It is possible, therefore, in his opinion, that in the original story from which this fragment was derived Jonah was an ordinary sailor, whose prayers to his God were more successful than those of his heathen companions.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*THE ARCHANGEL MICHAEL IN THE LIGHT OF
CRITICISM.*

“If there be with him an angel, an interpreter.”—*Job xxxiii.*
23, R.V.

SOME time ago,¹ having the privilege of speaking from St. Mary's pulpit, I expressed a doubt whether our conception of Biblical interpretation was altogether adequate. The fear had haunted me that as interpreters of the Bible, and especially of the Old Testament, we might perhaps have given a disproportionate degree of attention to philological subtleties and to what is now commonly called the Higher Criticism—good things, no doubt, but not the greatest and best. It was true that we had acted under a sense of duty, and had been rewarded by some measure of success. Both by oral instruction and by printed works we had made it understood that the Old Hebrew sages were not intellectual weaklings, and that their writings would remunerate the application of the ordinary principles of literary interpretation. In addition to this, the Higher Criticism, already impatient of its barriers, had begun to stimulate some students to conceive of the religion of Israel as historically developed, and, as the crown of the whole, to believe more intelligently in those ancient truths, the form of which, indeed, might be transitory, but their vitality would last for ever.

I ventured, however, to utter the conviction that though much had been done, the claims of investigation were not

¹ October 25, 1903. See EXPOSITOR, January 1904. The date of the present discourse is February 4, 1906.

fully satisfied. It was our business in the university, not only to teach but to prosecute the quest of truth. And it seemed that we should never reach the truth which lay at the heart of the Old Testament till we had gained a more historical comprehension of religious ideas and beliefs. I granted that both theoretically, and, to some extent, practically, the old view of Israel as a people set apart had been abandoned, but doubted whether we had acted with sufficient definiteness and consistency on the new view, which recognized the Israelitish people as an integral part of the nearer East, though gifted with a saving originality of its own. And as a preliminary to a satisfactory change in this respect I urged the importance, not only of more study of Eastern religions, but of a more persistent and resourceful investigation of the traditional readings of the Hebrew text. For our great object must henceforth be to put the Old Testament more fully and definitely in the light of history, and it was obviously the truest or the most probable critical text of the "old Hebrew writings on which historical inquiries would have to be based. I admitted that an expanded textual criticism would lead on to an expanded exegesis. But it would not interfere with a faithful conservative interpretation of the traditional text, one which should put this text in its right place as a historical monument of the thoughts and beliefs of the age of the redactors, and of the views which those redactors held of past history.

Need I assure students of the more aspiring sort that I had no desire to make their path needlessly difficult? I did but seek to point out how much work would remain for them to do, and to encourage those who had time before them to plan a successful career. Nothing has happened since then to change the tenor of my advice. The reported failure of Old Testament criticism has not taken place, but

it cannot, I fear, be denied that, in order fully to justify their position at the bar of history, critics will have to take a very long step forward. No one, too, who reflects can fail to see the two chief causes of our comparative backwardness, namely, first, a hesitation to recognize elements of non-Jewish origin or affinities in Jewish religion; and next, an objection on the part of many teachers to complicate their task by taking up new and deep textual problems. And of these two causes is it not the second which most imperatively requires attention? The question of the text is, in fact, so important, so far-reaching, that we seem to be called upon to postpone other tasks in its favour. Some of us, I know, are tempted to think that we have done nearly all that might be done to settle it. Believe me, it is an illusion. Throughout the Old Testament there are textual phenomena of the most interesting kind which it is our duty to collect and study, looking below the often deceitful surface till we have enough to justify some assured inferences. After this, we must at least begin to recast our exegesis in accordance with these results, and with the facts of Semitic religion generally. It will be no easy task, I confess, and the subtle influence of our examination system is only too likely to hinder us. Still, that steadfastness in results which examinations naturally assume is unknown to true criticism. It is our duty from time to time to test the foundations of the critical opinions which have come down to us, or in which, by our own choice, we have for a length of time acquiesced. We have a great prize before us—not the winning of the praise of men, but the placing of the Biblical records more fully in the light of history. And as a churchman must I not add that we have to aim at the promotion of a more rightly adjusted piety, which shall not be always craving to have new truths pared down, but rejoice in a more complete apprehension of the rich contents of religion?

Such are some of the suggestions and considerations which, in this parting of the ways, I have been called upon to offer. May the seeds lodge in some candid minds! It is our common lot as students to have to move our tents from station to station. Let us accept our destiny with uplifted and thankful hearts, remembering the invisible presence of the "angel," the "interpreter"! It is time, however, that I should leave general principles. I will now ask your attention to the strange facts connected with the archangel Michael. How came these facts to be, and what is their historical and religious significance?

Let me begin by referring to a well known passage in Colossians (ii. 8), where the writer warns Christians against missing their prize by a self-made humility and cultus (*θρησκειά*) of the angels. This implies that in the Phrygian city of Colossae many Christians fancied that they could only approach their far-off heavenly Father by the mediation of angels, who therefore actually received worship. There can be no doubt about this strange fact. In a striking passage near the end of the canonical Apocalypse,¹ the real or imaginary John admits that he fell down to worship (*προσκυνῆσαι*) before the angel—evidently some exceptionally mighty angel, one of the Four or the Seven, but was forbidden by him to do so. To the Colossians, too, the greatest angel was undoubtedly one of the Four or the Seven, viz., Michael. Outside the walls of their city, at the chasm of the river Lycus, stood in later times a grand church dedicated to this mighty Being, under the title of the archangel or the chief captain, the legend being that when an inundation threatened destruction, Michael (who, as we know, was the prince of water) cleft the chasm, so that the water might run away.² Tradition also said that he made

¹ Rev. xxii. 8; cf. xix. 10.

² Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. 214–216.

this promise to the sick, "Whosoever shall take refuge here, in faith and fear calling upon the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and Michael the chief captain, by the name of God and my name, he shall not depart grieved."¹ In truth, it was through the reputation of Michael, not only as the victor over the swollen waters, but as a healer and compassionate friend of man, that both in Phrygia and elsewhere the cultus of Michael grew to such an enormous height. When, in that Jewish book *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,² which was adopted and interpolated by Christians, Levi says to the angel who talks with him, and who has given him shield and sword, "O my lord, I pray, tell me thy name, that I may call upon thee in the day of trouble," the angel's answer is, "I am the angel who intercedes for the race of Israel that he may not be crushed to pieces, for every evil spirit stormeth against them."³ That is, "I am Michael, active alike in prayer and in deed against the demons." His prayers, in fact, were not less mighty than his deeds, for according to the popular belief he was the mediator between God and man,⁴ the heavenly high priest.⁵ And if we would realize the depth and inwardness of the piety which this strange belief nourished, let us read the prayers in the encomia composed, it is said, by three bishops at the time when the cultus of Michael was at its height, that is, about the beginning of the seventh century A.D. Here is one of them: "O thou archangel Michael, pray to God for us that He may open to us the hand of His mercy and blessing, lest the hope of thy offering and gift which we bring to God in thy holy name, O archangel

¹ Anonym. Bonn., c. 12, ap. Lueken, *Michael*, p. 75.

² Levi, c. 5.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. c. 6.

⁵ *Hagigah*, 12 b; Hermas, *Mand.* x. 3; 2, 3; *Sim.* viii. 2, 5; Encomium of Eustathius, in Budge, *St. Michael*, p. 105.

Michael, perish from our hands. Thou knowest our hearts, and our love towards thee. We have no helper (*προστάτης*) beside thee, for thou hast been our helper from our youth up, and thou hast been an ambassador for us before God our Saviour.”¹

You may perhaps tell me that the date of the encomia being so late, we cannot use them in illustration of the New Testament. Sound method, however, does not always preclude the use of late authorities in the study of the history of religious beliefs. There is no reason why such a prayer as this should not have been framed even in the second century A.D. There was nothing strange in praying to such a great Being as Michael. The Jews did so, and why should not the Christians? Of course this involved decking out Michael with titles, some of which he ought not to share with a second. For instance, he is said to have “ordered the denizens of heaven, and redeemed the peoples of the earth”; he is also called “the likeness and similitude of God Almighty.”² Strangely enough, however, the more Michael is honoured, the deeper, in a certain most undesirable sense, becomes the reverence for Christ, the reality of whose human nature is effaced.

Great indeed was the temptation to a cultus of Michael. Christians and Jews alike looked to him for help, not only in life but in death, and at the last day. It was Michael who would blow that trumpet blast which would wake the sleeping dead,³ and when on that awful day the pious soul had been placed by Michael before the divine tribunal, it was the same gracious Being on whose intercession he would rely.⁴ No wonder that Christian tombstones and amulets

¹ *St. Michael the Archangel*. Translation by E. A. Wallis Budge (1894), p. 25. Quoted by Lueken.

² *Ibid.* pp. 8, 80.

³ So the Midrash, also Petrus-Apoc., Aethl., etc. (Lueken, *Michael*, p. 50).

⁴ Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, p. 54 (Lueken, p. 131).

so often bear the names of Christ, Michael and Gabriel.¹ Yes, Gabriel. For of him also, though in less abundance, great things are said.² In fact, to solve the problem of Michael will enable the skilled student to solve that of Gabriel.

You may perhaps have remarked that I have not kept Jewish evidence strictly apart from Christian. It is really impossible to do so. The Jews were among the first teachers of the Christians in speculation; in Hermas, for instance, the conception of Christ is based on the Jewish statements respecting Michael.³ In one respect, however, the Jewish notion was narrower than the Christian. To the Jews Michael was the patron of Israel; to the Christians, of the human race.⁴ But how, we ask, came the idea of Michael's patronship of Israel to develop? Was not Israel the cherished possession of Yahweh Himself? How can He delegate the care of His own "son" to another?

Obviously the idea referred to was suggested by the belief in the angelic princes of the heathen nations; the Book of Daniel shows this. There is a difficulty, however, which I hope to remove, arising out of the fact—already noticed by an ancient Rabbi⁵—that whereas the seventy princes of the nations were subjected divinities, Michael (as orthodox Jews believed) was the delegate of his Creator. Certainly this is remarkable. In former times it was Yahweh who fought Israel's battles, but now it is His angelic representative, the same who in Daniel xii. 1 receives the title, "the great prince who protecteth the sons of thy people." And here is another noteworthy fact. The popular Jewish

¹ Lueken, pp. 118 f.

² On the Gabriel traditions, see Driver's note on Dan. viii. 16, and cf. Lueken's *Michael*.

³ Ibid. pp. 148-154; cf. Bousset, *Offenbarung*, p. 399.

⁴ See e.g. *Ascens. of Isaiah* (Charles), ix. 23, second Greek recension.

⁵ Ibid. p. 14.

exegesis is constantly finding references to Michael in the sacred history. It was Michael, for instance, who communed with Abraham at Mamre, and led Israel through the wilderness, and through Michael that Israel obtained its best possession—the Law. How came Israel to suppose this? Surely this is a point which requires a full explanation.

In Jewish eschatology, too, strange things are said about Michael; the Christians did not hesitate to borrow them. I will here only mention two or three statements. It is Michael who, in concert with Gabriel, will intercede successfully for the final liberation of Israel, Samael the accuser, the angelic patron of Israel's foe, Edom, being chased away. It is Michael, too, who, as the "chief captain," will in the latter days overcome the hosts of Gog and Magog. But strangest of all is the section of Jewish lore which reveals Michael to us as a cosmic power. Not only is he the chief of the four mighty angels of the Face or Presence,¹ and of the seven Watchers,² but, according to Enoch lxix. 15–23, he is in possession of the divine oath through which the earth was founded, and the sun and moon fulfil their appointed course. He is the prince of the world, and not only of Israel; God's viceroy, who preserves the universe. And even if it is only in Revelation xii. that we hear of his successful struggle with the dragon of chaos and darkness, yet it is evident that Revelation xii. is mainly derived from a Jewish source. Here, then, is one of the strangest honours that Michael has received; it is not the Being "like a son of man" (Dan. vii. 13), nor the World-Redeemer or Messiah, but Michael, who has the privilege of representing the Good Principle in its fight against the Bad at the end of the days.³

¹ See Eth. Enoch xl.

² Ibid. xx.

³ See Cheyne, *Bible Problems* (1904), pp. 218–222.

I ask, therefore, How is all this to be accounted for? It is not enough to reply that angelology was rampant, and that the imagination grows by exercise. There must be some definite historical explanation, and I will give that which seems to me the best, beginning with the observation that the four angels of the Presence and the seven Watchers are, by Jewish theologians, distinguished from the other angels by their creation on the second day,¹ and by their having a permanent existence.² To this I add that there is the strongest probability that originally they were not dependent beings at all. From a comparative historical point of view the holy Four are derived from the gods of the four quarters of the world, who, both in the Egyptian and in the North American mythologies, are the living pillars of the heaven; the holy Seven, called Watchers, like the Amshaspands of Zoroastrianism, come from the sleepless rulers of the sky, the sun, the moon, and the five planets. Some of the Jews, indeed, were dimly conscious of this, for, as the Talmud shows, they sacrificed to the sun, the moon, the planets, and Michael.³ Michael, however, and his double or offshoot Gabriel, must originally have been distinct from the Four and from the Seven. Things are said of them which exceed all that is related of the other angels put together. They are indeed even called the "kings of the angels."⁴ From whence then can Michael (to put aside Gabriel as superfluous) be derived?

An eminent Jewish scholar⁵ has plausibly suggested that he may be the Zoroastrian Amshaspand Vohumanô (Good Thought), who, like Michael, is the pious soul's chief helper

¹ Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 4, 1; cf. *Sim.* ix. 6, viii. 3, 3 (Lueken, p. 112).

² See *Bereshith Rabba*, par. 78.

³ *Hullin*, 40a; *Abodah Zarah*, 42 b.

⁴ *Midrash Shir ha-Shirim*, on iii. 7.

⁵ Kohut, *Jüd. Angelologie* (1866), p. 24.

on its last journey,¹ and who, with the other Amshaspands, takes part in the final struggle with Ahriman and the serpent. Such incomplete parallelisms, however, do not help us much. There were other conductors of the soul besides Vohumanô; ancient Jews identified Michael with Hermes Psuchopompos, or with Osiris or Anubis. And as for the great final struggle, Vohumanô is not the chief captain like Michael.

A better parallelism can be drawn between Michael and Mithra, the wonderful phases of whose worship, now in splendour, now passing into eclipse, I need not recall in detail.² If Mithra, even more than the Parsee Messiah Sôshyans, is parallel to Christ, it follows that he must to a great extent be parallel to Michael. We may even venture to go further, and assert that in Michael, as well as in a later product of Jewish angelology, who, as it seems, actually bears a name derived from Mithra—I mean Metatron, the so-called “driver of the (heavenly) chariot”³—there are elements directly derived from Mithra. No apology is needed for this. It is now beyond dispute that Persian religion, in its various forms, was too powerful and on the whole too congenial to the Jews not to exercise a considerable influence on Judaism. Again and again the leaders of the Jews showed a wonderful power of assimilating external beliefs, and we may perhaps say that in the person of Michael the god Mithra surrendered his crown to the God of the Jews, as he had done once before to that glorious Being who comes nearest to the God of the later prophets—Ahura Mazda.

At the same time we must not disregard the hardly less

¹ Later on his place is taken by the holy and strong Sraosha.

² See Cumont, *Mystères de Mithras*.

³ See Kohut, op. cit. pp. 36-42. For Metatron as Psuchopompos, see the *Testament of Job*.

potent influences of Babylonia.¹ If Michael was "the merciful one," "the mediator between God and man," the healer, the dragon slayer, so before him was Marduk. It is not inconceivable that the Jews, whose forefathers had long ago virtually substituted Yahweh for Marduk in the creation story, may have fused the god Marduk with a celestial figure of their own, viz., Michael.

Michael, then, is a reflexion, not only of Mithra, but of Marduk. As such he owes his fuller being, not to the theologians, but to the people, though the Jewish theologians accepted the popular faith with modifications. But is this really a complete explanation of Michael? Surely the way in which he is introduced in Daniel implies that the name had a long history behind it. Even if some of the features of Michael were either borrowed from Marduk, or deepened through the contact of the Jews with Marduk worshippers, yet the name Michael, as applied to a celestial Being, cannot possibly have a Babylonian origin.

We may at this point be helped by remembering that Michael is represented in Enoch as the chief of the Angels of the Face or Presence. Now "face" or "presence" is a term applied in Phœnician, and therefore possibly also in Hebrew, to a divine Being who represents the supreme God. Is there any Being spoken of in the Old Testament who stands apart from all other Beings except the One, and who is called the Face, or representation, of Yahweh? There is. He appears with special frequency in Genesis, Numbers, and Judges, and much difficulty has his appearance caused to critics. The name which he bears is Mal'ak Yahweh, for which the English Bible gives "the angel of the Lord." The objection to this is that Mal'ak Yahweh is by no means a mere angel or messenger, but equivalent

¹ Cheyne, *Bible Problems* (1904), pp. 224-226; Zimmern, *Keilinschriften*, etc., 3rd ed., p. 376.

to Yahweh or Elohim (i.e. God). Moreover, in Exodus xxiii. 21 the name of Yahweh is said to be "in him," and in Exodus xxiii. 14 he is called by Yahweh "my face," i.e. my representation.¹ It is plain, therefore, that Mal'ak must have come from some proper name. Not indeed from "Michael"—for this means "who is like the Divinity?"—and is therefore not suitable as a divine name, but from some name out of which, according to analogies, both Michael and Mal'ak can have come.

Theology, though much interested in the result, cannot, of course, offer any suggestion. What we have before us is a twofold historical problem, viz. (1) What is the name out of which both Michael and Mal'ak can have developed? ² and (2) What is the significance of the combination of the two names, viz. the uncertain first name and Yahweh? It is, however, only the solution of the second problem which can be mentioned here. It is this—that the all-powerful representative of Yahweh and all-merciful friend of man, so often spoken of in the early books, is a Being who was once worshipped by the Israelites in combination with Yahweh, but who was afterwards completely subordinated to Him. In the period during which he was so worshipped, he often bore a name compounded of his own name and that of Yahweh, but afterwards, when such combined worship was frowned upon by the best of Israel's teachers, his name was modified, sometimes into Mal'ak, "messenger," or Mal'aki "my messenger," sometimes into Michael, "who is like the Divinity?"

It is now possible to understand better those strange speeches of the Most High in Genesis, "Let *us* make man"

¹ In the late passage, Isa. lxiii. 9, we find the singular phrase "the angel of his face," which can only mean "the angel who is his face (=representation)."

² See *Enc. Biblica*, "Michael," "Michaiah." In the writer's *Genesis* the explanation will be justified at length.

(Gen. i. 26), "the man is become as one of *us*" (Gen. iii. 22), and "let *us* go down" (Gen. xi. 7). Nor is it any longer uncertain how the Jews came to identify the "Angel of the Lord" with Michael. They must have had at least the shadow of a tradition that the great and good Being upon whom they loved to lavish all the worthiest titles of the Babylonian God Marduk and the Persian God Mithra, was the same of whom their sacred writers had related so many beautiful stories. Indeed, except as regards the name, it was perfectly correct to say that Michael relieved the forlorn Hagar, talked with Abraham at Mamre, interposed for Isaac at the mountain of sacrifice, and led the people of Israel through the wilderness.

It would be a delightful task to trace the references to this honourably deposed deity (Michael) throughout the Old Testament, and to supplement these from later Jewish and Christian sources. It would in fact be a study in the development of a divine ideal. The prologue would be concerned with that strange but no longer obscure story in Genesis xxxii., where Jacob wrestles for a blessing with a divine Man—a story which has been glorified by Charles Wesley, in the hymn, "Come, O thou Traveller unknown." And the epilogue would deal with the Archangel Word and the High Priest Word of the Jewish philosopher and theologian Philo, for it is obvious that the Logos of Philo is closely related to Michael. I trust, however, that I have opened a door through which many others may be enabled to pass.

Among those "others" I think especially of young men. To them we teachers would fain pass on the torch of life—life, in all its varied meanings. And we must do so promptly, for losses befall us. To-day I may fitly recall to mind the late President of Chicago University, William Rainey Harper, whose treasure-house of learning on Amos and Hosea had just been opened to students before his last

fatal illness. Truly "being made perfect in a little while, he fulfilled long years" (Wisd. iv. 13). And what is the message of his life? Surely this, that we put our whole strength into our work, and shrink from no task, however hard, which a sense of duty lays upon us. "If there be with us an angel, an interpreter," to lead us on the way, why should we fear?

My younger friends, I would now speak directly to you, and connect my words with the passage in the speech of Elihu, from which my text is taken (Job xxxiii. 23). It is true, the greater part of the verse is corrupt, though not beyond reach of restoration; it refers almost certainly to Michael, as, like the Most High, the healer of diseases. But the opening words are plain, and they have a comfort for students. Elihu says in effect that there is a great heavenly Being, whose business it is to interpret God to man and man to God. This Being speaks with authority for God, for he is himself a partaker of the Divine nature. He can also sympathize with man, for he is constantly occupied with human affairs, and from time to time manifests himself in human form. This is the imaginative vesture of the essential truth that there is an aspect of the Divine nature through which light is conveyed to the human soul, and which emboldens man to believe that his highest aspirations will not be disappointed. Yes, Michael, like Parakletos, is for us the symbol of the self-interpreting aspect of the Deity. Michael, too, may encourage us to form a bold but strangely sweet hope for ourselves. Shall it not be one of our chief aims to produce greater clearness in all the departments of life—to interpret one class to another, one age to another, one science or branch of knowledge to another? Heaven, as an old Rabbi said, is a clear world; and may not even we do something to dissipate a few of the mists of earth?

Yes, it is a worthy ambition to be an interpreter. And

if the words which I have been permitted to speak to-day should awaken in a few young men the desire to be foremost workers in the expansion of Biblical interpretation, it would be a result which would gladden my heart more than any material gain. For "the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few."

T. K. CHEYNE.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XIV. THE PERFECTION OF CHARACTER.

(1) THERE is no evidence of the truth and the worth of Christianity that appeals so strongly to the modern reason and conscience as the character of Jesus. The current aversion to metaphysics is accompanied by a prevalent appreciation of ethics. Many men want a non-miraculous Christianity who would scorn a non-moral. In the realm of ethics they will, more or less consciously, admit the supernatural which they banish from the province of physics. The perfection of the character of Jesus is as inexplicable naturally—by His heredity and environment—as is His virgin birth or His bodily resurrection; but many who feel no sense of loss in denying the physical, would feel themselves poor indeed if deprived of the ethical marvel. Not only so, but their intellectual standpoint makes possible such belief in the one sphere and not in the other. Although, first, determinism, and then materialism have confidently denied human freedom, and have endeavoured to represent human character as the necessary resultant of various forces, yet even those who formally accept this conclusion practically often ignore it, and recognize in human life less uniformity and greater variety than in the processes of nature; for them history seems a less rigid system than nature, and their thought can allow exceptions in the former without the same sense of incongruity as in the latter. Just because what is natural in human character has not been so fully explored and clearly defined as in physical processes, the extraordinary in the one does not appear as supernatural as it would in the other. Thus a moral and an intellectual reason seem to combine in the readiness of many who deny all miracles to accept the

perfection of character of Jesus, which is not really—although it may be apparently—less supernatural.

(2) So general is this recognition of the moral supremacy of Jesus that it does not seem at all necessary to pause on the one hand to prove the moral impossibility of the assumption that the portrait in the Gospels is fictitious, the work of the imagination, inspired by the affection of the disciples; or, on the other, to disprove the charges against the character of Jesus that have from time to time been advanced by unbelief. But, while this twofold task may not be imperative, it will serve the main purpose of this *Study* very briefly to call attention to the two confirmatory evidences which doubt and denial may offer to Christian faith. In the first place, the more closely the picture presented in the Gospels is studied the more symmetrical and harmonious will it appear to be, the more consistent with all the claims made for the subject of it. It is moral perfection, nothing else and nothing less, that meets us in the Gospel story. Those who were ultimately responsible for the eye- and ear-witness to the words, and works, and ways of Jesus cannot have been either deceivers or deceived; for, in the one case, they would have lacked the moral integrity, and in the other the moral discernment, which would have made them at all capable of conceiving the ideal presented to us as a reality; here and there, notwithstanding the utmost care, they must have fallen into some error of moral judgment, which would have introduced some flaw of moral character into their portrait of Jesus. The Gospels may, as modern scholarship insists, reflect customs, beliefs, and needs of the time and the place of their composition; but it is morally certain that the picture of the Person of Jesus in the Gospels cannot be the product of any temporary or local, mental, moral, or religious tendencies of the writers, for the perfection there presented

transcends, not only the actualities, but even the aspirations, of the age and the race to which Jesus belonged.

(3) An examination of the accusations that have been brought against the character of Jesus only serves to justify our confidence that Christian faith can boldly repeat on His behalf the challenge which He Himself cast down to His enemies: "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" (John viii. 46). Even if the words mean, "Which of you proves Me to be in error regarding the nature of sin?" it is, if less directly, a claim of sinlessness, as only absolute moral integrity can possess absolute moral insight. The charges betray more ingenuity in the service of prejudice than historical understanding and moral insight. The Lad in the Temple is said to show disregard of the feelings and disobedience to the wishes of His earthly parents (Luke ii. 4). But does not His enthusiasm for God and His temple justify His forgetfulness of these other duties, especially if, as is not improbable, some communication had been made to Him regarding His vocation by His parents, as has been already suggested in the *Third Study*. The severity of the language of Jesus to His mother at Cana (John ii. 4), as also His repudiation of the authority of His family in His public work (Mark iii. 33-35) is explicable, as has been shown in the *Seventh Study*, by the necessity of His surrender of home in order that He might fulfil His vocation. The permission given by Jesus to the demons to enter the swine at Gadara has been regarded as an unjustified violation of the rights of property, or a blameworthy instance of cruelty to animals (Mark v. 13). In the discussion on the limitations of the knowledge, it has been maintained that Jesus neither intended nor anticipated the destruction of the swine, and that the permission which is attributed to Him is due to a misunderstanding of the word by which the cure was effected (Matt. viii. 32). Foolish anger has

been assigned as the motive of the cursing of the fig-tree (Mark xi. 14); but surely it is more reasonable to regard the act as a solemn warning in symbol of the approaching judgment on the Jewish people, even if we cannot explain the story as the misunderstood tradition of a parable (Luke xiii. 7). Violence is charged against Him in connexion with the expulsion of the traders from the temple (Mark xi. 15-16); but is there not a holy indignation against and punishment of wrong-doing? The moral difficulty, which from the common point of view the choice of Judas involves, has been dealt with in the *Twelfth* Study. The seemingly harsh answer given to the Syrophenician mother (Mark vii. 27) is probably Jesus' rebuke of Jewish exclusiveness in His disciples by the use of their own terms; He shows them what their unwillingness to come into contact with Gentiles involves. If we give due weight to the limitation of His knowledge, the demands and the difficulties of His vocation, the enthusiasm of His disposition, not only will all such charges fall to the ground, but we shall, even in the instances so abused, find proofs of His wisdom and grace.

(4) Although all these accusations can be disproved, although the Gospels present Jesus to us without fault or flaw, although His enemies could bring only false charges against Him, and at last condemned Him on a charge of blasphemy, which for Christian faith appears only a necessary confession of His position and vocation; yet it may be argued that the defects of childhood and youth, before His character was fully developed in Him, and His ministry before the eyes of men was entered on, must be assumed in Him; for, as the study of the child shows, instincts and appetites which come into conflict with moral law have in its growth the start of conscience and volition, and thus its moral life is from the outset handicapped, even if we deny any inheritance of sinful tendency. But this assump-

tion Christian faith rejects ; it affirms that the personal development of the Child Jesus was divinely preserved from inherited taint or natural flaw until His moral probation could begin. The belief in the virgin-birth (see the *Second Study*), if not absolutely necessary to, is a support to the belief in the sinlessness of Jesus from infancy onwards. A confirmatory evidence is offered in Jesus' own consciousness ; for nowhere in His words does He betray any remembrance of fault or failure in the past. It is not present sin alone that makes a man conscious of sinfulness ; past sin leaves a memory behind, which forbids moral satisfaction. There is no evidence that Jesus carried such a burden. He calls men to repentance, but He never Himself exhibits the grace of penitence. We must deny His moral sincerity and sensibility if we admit that He had sinned, however little, in the past years of His youth. It does not seem necessary to affirm that Jesus never joined His disciples in the use of the prayer He Himself had taught them with its petition for pardon, for in His Baptism, as on His Cross, He in His love identified Himself with the sinful race ; yet we must maintain that there is no proof of confession of sin and desire for pardon on His own behalf. The argument from silence, here employed, is not open to objection as it usually is, because it is in the extreme improbable that the Evangelists would have had the skill to suppress every trace of such confession and desire if penitence had had the place in the life of Christ which it must have in the life of every saint who is conscious of any sin. This absence of penitence from the experience of Jesus also disposes of another suggestion, that there may have been secret faults, flaws in the inner parts, hidden from men, although known to Himself. If we consider the inwardness of the morality of Jesus, the emphasis He laid on motive and disposition, it is impossible to believe that He could have concealed His penitence for

faults even that could themselves be concealed. Jesus never repented, because there was never anything in Him that required penitence.

(5) But the conclusive evidence of the sinlessness of Jesus seems to be found in the attitude that He assumed towards the sin of the world. He, as the Son of Man, claimed power on earth to forgive sins (Mark ii. 10), not by the proclamation of a general amnesty, but by the assurance of an individual pardon, as to the palsied man (*v.* 5: "Son, thy sins are forgiven"); or the sinful woman (Luke vii. 48-50: "Thy sins are forgiven . . . thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace"), or the penitent thief (Luke xxiii. 43: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise"). Although the offer of forgiveness is universal, yet the fact of being forgiven is individual. Not the Divine intention alone needs to be known, but also the human response, if the assurance is to be given as Jesus gave it. Who but the sinless can so read the heart of God and the heart of man as to know with the certainty of Jesus that the estrangement is ended? Who but the sinless would dare thus to pronounce what claims to be an infallible judgment on the condition in God's sight of another soul, as Jesus so confidently did? If we look more closely at the instances just given, the wonder and the surprise of Jesus' assurance of individual pardon will grow upon us. Most commentators assume that the palsied man and his friends wanted his bodily cure, and that in pronouncing him forgiven Jesus gave an uncraved boon; but this is to show a lack of moral insight, for pardon cannot come undesired; penitence is, and must be, the antecedent of the faith that claims the grace of God's forgiveness, although the offer of that grace may first awaken penitence. Jesus saw what no others saw—that the human conditions of the Divine pardon were fulfilled in the man. The sinful woman and the penitent

thief did not appear to any one save Jesus as capable of penitence, as accessible to the Divine pardon ; but He alone could judge unerringly the human heart.

(6) How confident He is that He can cure this disease of sin ! His plea, when He is reproached for eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, is that, as the Physician, His place is among the sick (Mark ii. 17). The Pharisees feared moral contagion from close contact with those whom they regarded as morally lax or depraved. Jesus was conscious of such moral vitality and vigour, that He knew Himself immune from any such peril ; sinners could not stain Him, for He could cleanse them. There seems no doubt that Jesus anticipated His death as a ransom for many (Matt. xx. 28), as the price of a moral deliverance, and that He desired His death to be remembered by His disciples as His offering of the " blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins " (Matt. xxvi. 28). Even if the last clause, which is not found in Mark xiv. 24, is the Evangelist's addition, yet the covenant Jesus had in view was one of forgiveness. (See Jer. xxxi. 34 : " For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more.") According to the Law the sin-offering must be without blemish (Lev. iv. 3) ; according to the prophet the Servant, whose soul is made " an offering for sin . . . had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth " (Isa. liii. 9, 10). It would appear intolerable to our conscience surely that any man, stained with sin, should claim that he could offer himself as a sacrifice to cleanse mankind from sin. Although Jesus in His patience and compassion, His humility and charity, promised forgiveness of " a word against the Son of Man," yet His solemn warning to His enemies shows how easily antagonism to Him might pass over into that attitude, which He describes as the sin against the Holy Ghost, for which as an eternal sin there is no for-

givenness" (Matt. xii. 32; Mark iii. 29). Not only does the Fourth Evangelist claim for the Son of Man the function of judgment (John v. 22, ix. 39), but in the Synoptists Jesus is represented as making the future destiny of men depend on their confession or denial of Him (Matt. x. 32, 33), and as judging the nations in accordance with their treatment of Him in His brethren (xxv. 31-46).

(7) Such claims to forgive and save, redeem and judge mankind are inconceivable, unless Jesus was conscious of His own absolute moral integrity and purity. To deny His sinlessness is to disown His claims. He cannot be enshrined in the heart, or enthroned in the life of man, unless He is without blemish or guile. Christian preaching is false witness, and Christian faith vain, for we are still in our sins (1 Cor. xv. 14-17), unless Christ, who knew no sin, was made sin for us (2 Cor. v. 21). The claims Jesus made for Himself are not an instance of how "vaulting ambition o'erleaps itself"; for, as we look more closely at His life, we cannot but be deeply impressed by His humility, the lowliness of His perfection. It was not in a humility, conscious of its own virtue and value, and thus annulling itself, that He said, "I am meek and lowly in heart," but in a genuine humility, which was content to be misunderstood by the wise and understanding, and sought to give rest of soul to the labouring and heavy-laden, not only in teaching given to them, but in a yoke shared with them (Matt. xi. 25-30); a humility which set not its mind on high things, but condescended to things that are lowly" (Rom. xii. 16). Christian theology, in laying stress on the witness of Christ to Himself, has very often misrepresented His character. He accepted His vocation not as the fulfilment of an ambition to be great, but as the dedication of Himself to a service and a sacrifice which God His Father willed, and men His brethren needed. What He claims

He claims only because the revelation of God in Him and the redemption of man by Him make the claim imperative. One cannot but feel that His lofty vocation, because so lonely, must have been to His lowly spirit a burden to be borne, and not a prize to be snatched. Whatever scholars may say about the origin of the phrase Son of Man, Jesus put His own meaning into it, attached His own worth to it; and does not His humility best explain it? Even when He is claiming functions that necessarily distinguish Him from all mankind, He seeks by this title as closely as possible to identify Himself with His brethren. That does not mean, as is sometimes assumed, that Jesus assigned these prerogatives to manhood as such, and was not conscious of a unique vocation; but that the humblest of the Messianic titles was most congenial to Him. In His Baptism at the beginning, as on His Cross at the end of His ministry, He made Himself one with man; "He was not ashamed to call men brethren" (Heb. ii. 11). His humiliation was not a fate imposed on Him, but the proof of His humility.

(8) Some special evidences of this characteristic of His moral perfection invite our closer study. In knowledge, in character, in power, He confessed Himself inferior to His Father. His confession of His ignorance regarding "that day and hour" (Matt. xxiv. 36) shows His meekness and lowliness of heart. It is no common grace for a teacher to plead lack of knowledge before those who are learning of him. Jesus' answer to the rich young ruler's address, "Why callest thou Me good? None is good save One, even God" (Mark x. 18; Matthew's version, "Why askest thou Me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good," xix. 17, is evidently an effort to escape what was felt to be a difficulty), is not to be explained, as it has so often been, as merely a correction of a mistake in the questioner; it is a glimpse into His inner life Jesus grants

to us. His work was not yet done, His warfare was not yet accomplished, He was still liable to temptation (Matt. iv. 1-11); He still felt the strain of His vocation; His baptism was not yet accomplished, and He was straitened (Luke xii. 50). His cup had not been drunk, and He dreaded it (Matt. xxvi. 39). Therefore He would not call Himself good, as His Father dwelling unchanged, unmoved, undisturbed in His blessed and glorious perfection. He anticipated that greater works would be accomplished by His disciples, because He was going to His Father; and this going would be an advantage both to Him and them, because He knew the Father to be greater than Himself (John xiv. 12, 28). Instead of ever seeking to make Himself equal with God, as His enemies misrepresented His words, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work," to mean (v. 17, 18), He always confessed His absolute dependence on, and His complete submission to God in all His words, works, and ways. It is significant that it is the Fourth Evangelist who gives an emphasis to the divinity of Christ such as is not found in the Synoptists, in whose pages abound the utterances of Jesus in which He acknowledges that all He is, speaks, and does is the gift of God's grace, wisdom, power. It is not at all likely that such a conception of the relation of Jesus to God would have originated in Ephesus at the end of the first century; and, therefore, allowing for modifications of the language of Jesus by the Evangelist, we may claim him confidently as a trustworthy witness to the humility characteristic of Jesus.

(9) The humility of Jesus cannot hide from us the transcendence of His goodness, the loftiness of His perfection. As has been indicated in the *Thirteenth Study*, His moral insight and spiritual discernment raised Him far above both law and prophets. The requirements of the one and the predictions of the other He fulfilled only as discovering in

their earthen vessels the heavenly treasures of a righteousness, wisdom, and grace of God hitherto unknown and un-hoped. His own age and people cannot explain Him ; He was unintelligible in spirit and purpose, character and conduct to His countrymen and contemporaries. He was so much an offence, as He was necessarily opposed to, because exalted above the passions and prejudices, nay, even the pieties and moralities of His own environment. He could be pitiful and forbearing, gentle and kind to the sinners and the outcasts of Jewish society because they opposed no inferior standards of morals, no lower type of piety to His own ideal of godliness and goodness, and He could by His grace trust and hope to win them to learn of Him, follow Him, and take His yoke. But the Pharisees and the scribes claimed to be the authoritative teachers and the exemplary guides of the people in morality and religion ; and Jesus, therefore, saw in them an antagonism to Himself, which, if persisted in, must prove fatal to themselves and all who trusted them for counsel and guidance. So transcendent was the perfection manifest in His Person and His teaching, that He had to remove as a hindrance the highest developments of the piety and the morality of His nation and His age. The severity of His condemnation of the legal morality and the ceremonial piety of scribes and Pharisees is not due to a want of humility, or a lack of charity ; but to His infallible perception that " that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God " (Luke xvi. 15), that the finality and sufficiency claimed by the scribes for their goodness and godliness was the most perilous and destructive opposition to God and the ideal, that vanity and pride are more fatal to the soul than animal appetite and sensual passion, because an invasion and a subjugation of the soul's inmost sanctuary, conscience and the consciousness of God, by sin. He who has so perverted his

moral and religious sense that he is ever congratulating and never censuring himself, needs the severest and fullest condemnation ; his insensibility needs the stinging lash of unerring Divine judgment. That Jesus so clearly detected and so fully denounced the falsity and futility of the morality and religion of the scribes and Pharisees shows not only how independent and original His perfection was, but also how final, because absolute, is His ideal. Humanity, under the guidance and control of the Spirit of God, has advanced from age to age, but it has not transcended Jesus : in its truest aspirations and its best endeavours it most realizes His transcendence.

(10) It seems necessary to lay emphasis on these two features of the perfection of Jesus—His humility towards God, and His transcendence of the righteousness of man—before noticing the feature which is probably the most prominent in the common Christian consciousness—the sympathy of Jesus, or the largeness of His ideal. Without those features this is likely to be misconceived. The tenderness and gentleness and kindness of Jesus may be conceived sentimentally, and may encourage a feeble emotionalism in the Christian life without the sufficient reverence for God or for His Christ. He who has soared above all mankind in the loftiness of His moral achievement ever stooped before God in the lowliness of His religious aspiration. The majesty of the perfection of God, which Jesus so humbly revered, while He so transcendently revealed, forbids the familiarity which is a constant and serious peril of the intimate communion with Him which the largeness of His love encourages. The love of Jesus makes Him "heir of all the ages," "citizen of the world," to whom nothing human is alien. The largeness of His perfection is shown in His treatment of women and children on the one hand, in His attitude towards the outcasts of Jewish society and the

Gentiles on the other. His disciples were surprised that He talked with the Samaritan woman (John iv. 27) ; His acceptance of the penitent gratitude of the sinner in the city offended His Pharisee host (Luke vii. 39) ; even His disciples could not understand a woman's heart as Jesus could, and murmured at the wasteful generosity of Mary (Matt. xxvi. 8). In the reference to His own burial Jesus gave to her acts of anointing may we not read a deeper meaning than at first sight appears ? From His disciples, opposed to His Cross, He had failed to find sympathy ; but to Mary He had been able to speak freely, and what she did was a token of unchanging love and unswerving loyalty in view of His Cross, an assurance that one heart at least would not faint or fail in devotion to the very end. When we remember the contempt for woman which we meet with in Rabbinic writings, this regard for womanhood is a mark of Jesus' perfection. So, too, is His interest in childhood. He watched children at their play (Matt. xi. 16, 17) ; He made a child an example to His disciples (xviii. 2) ; He was displeased when the disciples desired to keep mothers and children away from Him, and took the children in His own arms and blessed them (xix. 13-15). In His lowliness He was Himself childlike ; in His tenderness womanly. The strength of manhood was accompanied by the charm of childhood and the grace of womanhood. By birth and breeding a Jew, He had none of the limitations even of Jewish piety and patriotism. "Publicans and sinners" were chosen as His companions, not from any vain or weak pity, but because His moral insight and spiritual discernment detected in them possibilities of goodness and godliness which He could not discover in scribes and Pharisees. In the last study enough was said regarding this offence against Jewish prejudice. Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles has often been misunderstood. On the one hand, He most

generously recognized Gentile faith (the centurion's, Matt. viii. 10; the Syrophenician mother's, xv. 28); He was deeply moved by the desire of the Greeks to see Him (John xii. 23); He commended the gratitude of the Samaritan leper (Luke xvii. 18); He presented a Samaritan as worthy of imitation (x. 33). On the other hand, He confined the mission of His disciples to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," expressly excluding the Gentiles and the Samaritans (Matt. x. 5, 6); He refers seemingly with disparagement to the things the Gentiles seek (vi. 32), and do (v. 47), and to the vain repetitions in their prayers (vi. 7); He enjoins that the impenitent brother is to be regarded as the Gentile and the publican (xviii. 17); He limits His own even as His disciples' mission, and meets the Syrophenician mother's prayer with the seemingly harsh refusal: "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it to the dogs" (xv. 26). The limitation of the mission of the disciples is explicable by their inexperience; they would not know how to deal with Gentiles. There is no contempt or censure in the references to the Gentiles in the Sermon on the Mount; Jesus states, as matter of fact, the spiritual inferiority of the Gentiles to incite His disciples to aim at higher excellence. When we remember Jesus' tender solicitude for publicans, we may conclude that the treatment of an impenitent brother as the Gentile or the publican would not exclude a loving care for his good. The limitation of His own mission is adequately accounted for by the nature of His vocation. He came as Saviour of the world, but the divinely-appointed historical function for Him was as Messiah of the Jewish people. Not only did the shortness of the day in which alone He could work forbid any wide diffusion of interest or effort, and demand the utmost concentration on His task, but Jewish exclusiveness was so intense, that any premature extension of His Gospel to the

Gentiles would have prevented any effective offer of the divinely-promised salvation to the Jewish people. The fidelity of God required that the chosen people should get its full opportunity to welcome its Messiah, and that no stumbling-block should be put in the way of its faith. Although the nation proved unbelieving, the faith of some was won, which would probably have been hindered, if the ministry had been wider in its range. Jesus submitted, not without pain, to this necessity. The sneer of His enemies. "Will He go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (John vii. 35), shows that there was something in Jesus that suggested the possibility of such a Gentile ministry even to those to whom it would appear as "the climax of irrationality for any man" seriously claiming the title "of Messiah." The insistence of Jesus on the necessity of His death when the Greeks came to Him (John xii. 23) suggests that the possibility of such a Gentile ministry as an escape from Jewish hostility presented itself even to Him. It was rejected by Him, not because He was indifferent or hostile to the Gentiles, but because His death at the hands of the Jewish people was the cup His Father had given Him to drink. His limitation of His ministry was not through defect of love to man, but through completeness of love to God, to whose will in self-sacrifice He submitted Himself. His words to the Syrophenician mother do not express His own disposition to her; but echo, by way of grieved, indignant protest, the Jewish prejudice, which imposed this unwelcome limitation on His work in the world, a limitation to which submission to God's purpose required Him to submit. His disciples had probably protested against His withdrawal from His ministry in Galilee and His retirement into a Gentile region, and had thus forced on His attention at the time this national exclusiveness; probably they had even used the

very words He repeated under circumstances in which even they must have felt how inhuman their narrow prejudice was.

(11) Although the Cross must be the subject of a special Study, this Study would be incomplete without a brief reference, in conclusion, to the vicarious and sacrificial character of the love of Jesus. He loved so intensely and unreservedly the human race, that He so completely identified Himself with its need and peril, its burden and struggle, its sorrow and shame, its sin and curse, that it was possible for Him to become not only its representative, but even its substitute, not by any legal fiction, but by a personal experience. This identification with mankind was necessarily sacrificial to the uttermost. He had to give Himself fully and freely in His agony, darkness, desolation, that He might become humanity under the burden of sin and the shadow of death, in order that He might be the propitiation for the world, and secure redemption and reconciliation for man. His being made sin for us was the final evidence that He knew no sin, the absolute proof of the perfection of His character.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE DESOLATE CITY.

THAT the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar was thorough, and that he drained her to the dregs, cannot be doubted. But when we attempt to estimate how much of the City remained habitable, and how many Jews were left in the land after the successive removals to Babylonia and the migration to Egypt, we encounter difficulties which prevent any near view of a result.

To begin with the people. There are no reliable data for the population of Judah or of Jerusalem before the Babylonian invasion. In 701 Sennacherib claims to have "carried off and counted as spoil" 200,150 Jewish men, women and children. If this means he deported them, it must be an exaggeration, for the number that Sargon took into exile, when he stripped of its inhabitants the larger land of Northern Israel, is stated as only 27,290; who, if we count them as the fighting-men, even then represent little more than a third of Sennacherib's vast figure. The alternative is to interpret the 200,150 as the whole population of the "forty-six walled cities and forts without number," which Sennacherib took captive: that is, practically all Judah outside the walls of Jerusalem. If we add to them a few tens of thousands for the capital, the result is a very reasonable figure for the population of a land of the size and fertility of Judah. An estimate has been made, from official lists of the inhabitants of practically the same extent of territory,¹ in the year 1892. Without Jerusalem or Hebron and its many villages, this amounts to over 170,000 souls,² Adding 40,000 for Jerusalem and the very moderate conjecture of 15,000 for the Hebron district, we get 225,000;

¹ By Baurath Schick in the *Zeitschrift d. deutsch. Palästina Vereins*, xix.

² Not 120,000, as Guthe states in his *Geschichte*, p. 256.

which is very near Sennacherib's figure, increased by an allowance for the population of Jerusalem. As we have seen,¹ Judah must have fully recovered from the disasters of 701 during the long and prosperous reign of Manasseh. We cannot therefore be far from the truth in estimating the Jewish nation in the end of the seventh century as comprising *at least* 250,000 souls. That would make it greater than the present population on the same territory. But this is not unlikely to have been the case.

The Biblical statements of the numbers deported by Nebuchadrezzar are conflicting. The Book of Kings says that in 598-7 Nebuchadrezzar carried to Babylon 8,000 *men*.² Another passage, wanting in the Septuagint and therefore probably a later insertion in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah,³ gives the number for 598-7 B.C. as 3,023 *Jews*; and adds for that of 586 B.C. 832 *souls from Jerusalem*, and for a third deportation in 581 B.C. 745 *souls, Jews*: in all 4,600. Although thus described as *souls* and *Jews* it is probable that according to the Oriental fashion fighting men only are intended. But from the Assyrian bas-reliefs it appears that upon their deportations families were not separated but marched away together; and the accounts of the Babylonian captivity imply that it included the women and children. The 4,600 fighting men will, therefore, on the usual calculation, have to be increased by half that number to represent all the males carried captive; and this sum must be at least doubled so as to include the women and girls. On that basis the Jews deported to Babylonia amounted to at least 14,000, but may have been as many

¹ EXPOSITOR for October, 1905.

² 2 Kings xxiv. 15, 16. The preceding verses which give 10,000 (or *all Jerusalem*) are apparently a later insertion, borrowed (Stade thinks, but without much reason) from an account of the later deportation in 586.

³ lii. 28-30.

as 19,000 or 20,000. But if we prefer to take the datum of the Book of Kings for 598-7, 8,000 fighting men, and add to it another 8,000 for 586 (a generous estimate, for we may reasonably infer that a second gleanings of the manhood and the prosperous classes of Judah was less than the first) we raise (on the method of reckoning adopted above) the total number deported by Nebuchadrezzar to 48,000 or 50,000. While if we put these two estimates together, on the ground that the three deportations, given in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah as 4,600, refer to other occasions than 597 and 586,¹ we get as the very highest figures possible on our data 62,000 or 68,000. There fall to be added the unknown but probably large number of the organized migration into Egypt,² as well as the scattered groups which would probably drift in the same direction.

Even then it is clear, on our estimate of the total population, that a large majority of the Jewish people remained on their land. This conclusion may be startling to us with our generally received notions of the whole nation as exiled. But there are facts which support it. Before the migration to Egypt, the people were themselves confident of a prosperous agriculture; and even after Johanan and his bands had left the country the Babylonians did not find it necessary to introduce colonists from other parts of the empire. It is true that the necessity may have been obviated, without Nebuchadrezzar's interference, by the encroachment of neighbouring tribes upon the territories of the depleted and disorganized people. The Samaritans pushed south into Ajalon and the neighbourhood. The Edomites drew in upon the Negeb. Ammonites and Moabites doubtless took their shares; and the desert nomads, always hovering upon

¹ Ewald would read in Jeremiah lii. 28-30, *17th*, for *7th*, year of Nebuchadrezzar.

² Numerous enough to form several settlements, Jer. xlv.

the borders of cultivation and even encamped in times of peace across its pastures, would take advantage of this crisis as they have done of every similar one to settle down in deserted fields and buildings. Yet the fact persists, that upon a much diminished territory some scores of thousands of Jews remained in Judah through all the period of the exile. They were, as the Biblical narratives testify, *the poorest of the land*, from whom every man of substance and of energy had been sifted; mere groups of peasants, without a leader and without a centre; discouraged, disorganized and depressed; bitten by hunger and compassed by enemies; uneducated and an easy prey to the heathenism by which they were surrounded. We can appreciate the silence which reigns in the Bible regarding them, and which has misled us as to their numbers. They were a negligible quantity in the religious future of Israel: without initiative or any influence except that of a dead weight upon the efforts of the rebuilders of the nation when these at last returned from Babylonia.

We may now consider the position of Jerusalem in this desperate condition of the land. Penetrating the City by a breach in her northern walls, the Babylonians sacked, burned and ruined her. Any treasure that remained and the whole of the costly furniture of the Temple were carried to Babylon.¹ The Temple itself, the Palace, and probably every other conspicuous building with many of the common houses were burned.² What could not be burned was dismantled: *the walls of Jerusalem he brake down round about.*³

The whole fighting force of the City, the men of substance, and the skilled workmen, with their families, were deported

¹ 2 Kings xxv. 13-17, and the fuller text in Jeremiah lii. 20-23.

² 2 Kings xxv. 9. The last clause of this verse, *and every great house burned he with fire*, is probably from the awkward repetition, a later addition. Still that is no reason why we should doubt so probable an assertion.

³ Ibid. verse 10.

to Babylon. Some of the baser sort of the people doubtless continued to herd in the ruins ; and among them may have been some priests, for an interesting story (preserved probably by Baruch ¹) tells of a band of pilgrims from Shechem, Shilo and Samaria, intent upon still obeying the Deuteronomic behests and passing with every sign of mourning to sacrifice in the ruined house of the Lord. With this exception Jerusalem seems to have been avoided by the remnants of the conquered people. They set up their political centre at Mizpah, and in all their proceedings which follow up to the migration to Egypt their ancient capital and its temple are ignored. This silence is significant. It is as if the shock of the fall of the City had been felt as a curse from heaven. Therefore there is practically no exaggeration in the statement which is so much doubted in that narrative of very mixed value in Jeremiah xlv. : *Ye have seen all the evil I have brought on Jerusalem and all the cities of Judah : they are a desolation, and no man dwelleth therein.*² Even the last clause may be accepted with only the slight qualification mentioned above. God's curse had fallen upon His ancient abode, and even the hopes of the people were hunted away from it.

But if the people who remained in the land thus avoided Jerusalem, the hearts of her own exiles continued to haunt her, and in the languor of their banishment still brooded over the scenes of her carnage and ruin. One of these visitants to that awful past has described it to us with a wealth and vividness of detail which justify the conclusions we have reached from the meagre data of the records. The second and fourth chapters of the Book of Lamentations or Dirges are generally, and on the whole rightly, regarded as by an eyewitness of the siege, the famine and the fall of

¹ Jer. xli. 4 ff.

² Verse 2.

Jerusalem. He composes, [it is true, with deliberate art, ranging his verses by their initial letters so as to form two acrostic poems under the twenty-two letters of the alphabet. But this is the only symptom of his work which tempts us to think of him as at a distance from the events he bewails ; and it is overborne not only by the vivid glimpses which we may reasonably suppose only a contemporary or eye-witness would have selected, but by the fervid passion as of one who himself suffered the horrors he paints, by the indignation he feels towards those who, still alive, were responsible for them, and by the unrelieved darkness and grief of both poems. All this implies a date before 561. The tradition that Jeremiah himself was the poet, is due to the Greek version alone and finds no support in the Hebrew, where the work is anonymous. The poetry, grand as it is, is inferior to Jeremiah's own ; the " rhetoric " with which it has not unjustly been charged could never be imputed to him. Nor had he ever that passion for the City or the Temple which these poems reveal. Their fall could not have come upon him with such a shock, unrelieved by hope. The poet writes as if he had been among the dupes of the prophets, whom he bitterly blames. He stands outside both their circle and that of the priests. He was a layman, probably a member of one of the upper and ruling classes of the city, of whom the Book of Jeremiah gives us so much evidence. He is in sympathy with the delicately nurtured. The fall of the monarch and the princes, to whom he imputes no blame, he feels as a desecration. He is pious, but not after the temper of Jeremiah. The fact that, as he puts it, Jahweh could *take post as the foe* of His own people, that the Lord could become *the Enemy*, had startled and shocked him. He comes back to it with amazement even now, when he appreciates the ethical reasons. To a citizen of Jerusalem, then, we owe these poems, a member or client of

one of the governing families ; and he sang of what he had seen, and had been stunned by, but now he is roused to the blame and the bitterness of it all. Some who acknowledge the original experience of the writer have thought of him as the victim with his City of one of her subsequent disasters. But it is plainly of Nebuchadrezzar's overthrow that he writes ; of a destruction of City and Temple which was never repeated except by Titus ; and of the flight and capture of Zedekiah.¹

A few words are necessary as to the rhythm. This is the now familiar elegiac measure, of which Professor Budde first made us aware. It is gradually become probable that the dominant factor in the rhythm or metre of Hebrew poetry was accent or stress, and not the quality or the number of the syllables. The basis of the elegiac measure is a couplet, of which the first line with a rising cadence has three accented syllables ; the second, with a falling cadence, two. In chapter ii. three of these couplets go to one acrostic verse : in chapter iv. two. The Hebrew text has passed to us through a succession of editors who were aware of the strophes but not of the structure of the lines. Therefore the text of these has to be amended ; some lines as they stand are too short, some too long. But we must take care not to apply the principle of the metre too rigorously to the text. Oriental artists have always avoided an absolute symmetry : and it may be that some of the irregularities, which we are inclined to get rid of as editorial additions, belonged to the original forms of the poems. The following translation aims at reproducing the cardinal features of the rhythm—alternate lines of three and two accents or stresses. I have had to admit three accents to some of the shorter lines, in which the epithet *daughter of Sion* occurs. For while the Hebrew for that has only one accent, the English has two. But, as

¹ iv. 21.

I am convinced, for the reasons given above, that Hebrew poets were not averse to admitting irregularities to their rhythms, I have no bad conscience about such inevitable exceptions in my translation. In order to avoid similar ones in other lines, I have sometimes rendered *daughter of my people* simply by *my people*. And occasionally I have reversed the position of two lines for the sake of the English rhythm or for the sake of a better climax. Otherwise the translation follows the original line by line. Where it is not literal, this has been indicated in the notes. Words that have been supplied are in italics.

LAMENTATIONS II.

Circa 570 B.C.

1. 8

How the Lord beclouds with his wrath
 The daughter of Sion.¹
 From heaven to earth hath he hurled
 The pomp of Israël.
 He hath not remembered his Footstool
 In the day of his wrath.

2. 2

The Lord hath engulfed without pity
 The homesteads of Jacob.
 He ruined [*and . . .*] in his wrath
 The strongholds of Judah.
 He smote to the earth, he profaned
 The realm and its princes.

3. 2

In the glow of his wrath he hath hewn
 Every horn of Israël.
 He allowed his right hand to retreat
 From the face of the foe.
 He hath burned in Jacob like fire,
 All round he devoured.

¹ *Or*, How the cloud of the wrath of the Lord
 Enshrouds the daughter of Sion.

4. ג

He hath bent his bow like a foe,
 He stands¹ an assailant.
 He hath slain each desire of the eye,
 In the tent of the daughter of Sion
 He hath poured out his fury like fire.
 * * * * *

5. ה

The Lord is become as a foe
 To swallow Isrâel,
 Engulfing her palaces all,
 And razing her strongholds.
 On the daughter of Judah he lavished
 Lamentation and woe.

6. ו

He hath torn from *his* Garden his Booth,³
 Demolished his Temple,⁴
 Jah hath forgotten in Sion
 Assembly and Sabbath,
 And spurned with the curse of his wrath
 Monarch and priest.

7. ז

The Lord hath discarded his Altar,
 His Holy Place scorned,
 Hath locked in the grasp of the foe
 Its fortifications.⁵
 How they shout through the house of the Lord
 Like a day of assembly!

8. ח

Of purpose did Jahweh destroy
 The wall of the daughter of Sion.

¹ Delete *his right hand* as too long for the rhythm and unnecessary.

² Line wanting.

³ Read בְּיָד . The Garden, of course, is the Land, the Booth the Temple.

⁴ The parallel line and the verb used in this line show that בְּיָד means here the *house of assembly*. In the fourth line it means *the assembly* or *congress* itself.

⁵ The sense is plain, the exact reading uncertain.

He stretched out the line nor withdrew
 His hand from th' engulfing,
 Fortress and rampart he wrung,
 Together they tottered.

9. ׀

Sunk in the earth are her gates,
 Her bars he hath shattered.
 Her king and her princes are exiles.¹
 The Torah is ceased !
 Even her prophets obtain not
 Vision from Jahweh.

10. ׀

They sit on the ground and are dumb,
 The elders of Sion ;
 They lift up the dust on their heads,
 They gird them with sackcloth.
 And low on the ground are the heads
 Of Jerusalem's maidens.

11. ׀

Mine eyes are wasted with tears,
 My bowels are troubled,
 My heart ² is poured out on the ground
 For the wreck of my people,
 For the infants and sucklings that perish
 On the streets of the city.

12. ׀

They are saying to their mothers, Ah where
 Are the corn and the wine ?
 As like one that is wounded they swoon
 On the streets of the city,
 As they pour out their lives [*to the death ?*]³
 On the laps of their mothers.

¹ Literally : *are among the Gentiles.*

² Literally : *my liver.*

³ Another accented word is needed for this line.

13. ד

How shall I rank,¹ how compare thee,
 Daughter of Jerusalem ?
 How shall I liken, how comfort thee,
 Virgin of Sion ?
 Vast as the sea is thy ruin ;
 Who will repair thee ?

14 ג

Thy prophets ? They dreamt² for thee
 Falsehood and flattery.
 They exposed not thy guiltiness
 To turn thy captivity,
 But they dreamt² for thee oracles
 That lied and misled.³

15. ד

They were clapping their hands at thee
 All who passed by.
 They were hissing and wagging their heads
 At the daughter of Jerusalem:—
 “ Did they call thee perfection of beauty,
 Joy of the earth ! ”

16. ה

Against thee they opened their mouths
 Thine enemies all,
 Hissing and gnashing their teeth⁴ :
 “ We have swallowed her up !
 Just this is the day we have looked for !
 We meet it, we see it ! ”

¹ Read with Meinhold (quoted by Budde) אֶתְּרִי (Isa. xl. 18) ; or at least with the Qerî אֶתְּרִי : *I take thee as a parable or warning.*

² Literally : *saw in vision* ; used of prophetic vision, but here in a bad sense.

³ Budde : *expulsion.*

⁴ Omit אֶתְּרִי, *they said*, which is unnecessary to the meaning, having probably been inserted by a commentator to mark what follows as a quotation ; and makes an accent too many for the rhythm.

17. י

Jahweh hath done what he planned,
 Discharging his word.
 As in days long ago he decreed,
 Ruthless he ruins.
 He hath given thee up to their joy,
 Exalted¹ thy foes.

18. ז

Let thy heart cry aloud to the Lord,²
 Clamour,³ O daughter of Sion,
 Let thy tears run down like a stream
 By day and by night.
 Give to thyself no respite,
 No rest to thine eye.

19. ק

Get thee up, sing out in the night
 At the start of the watches!
 Pour out like the waters thy heart
 In the face of the Lord!
 Lift up *now* before him thy hands
 For the life of thy children.⁴

20. ר

“Behold, O our God, and consider
 Whom thou maltreatest.
 Shall women devour their offspring,
 The infants they fondle?
 Or the Lord in the sanctuary slay
 The priest with the prophet?”

¹ Omit קַרְנֵי, *horn*, for the reasons given in the previous note.

² This line as it stands in the Hebrew gives no sense. Sion is addressed, and an imperative is necessary for the verb. Read צַעֲקֵי לַיהוָה with Ewald *et al.*

³ Reading with Budde הוֹמֵת לַיהוָה for the meaningless הוֹמֵת, *wall*.

⁴ To this verse a fourth couplet is added:—

They that have fainted for hunger
 At the top of all the streets.

21. ו

“They are strewn on the face of the streets
 Young men and old,
 My youths and my virgins are fallen
 At the edge of the sword.
 In the day of thy wrath thou hast slaughtered,
 And ruthlessly butchered.

22. ן

“Thou summonest as to a congress
 Terrors around.
 Not one did escape or was left
 In the day of his wrath.
 Those whom I nursed and brought up
 My foes have destroyed.”

LAMENTATIONS IV.

1. ם

How bedimmed is the gold, how changed
 The finest of gold,
 Down every street they have poured
 The stones of the Temple.¹

2. ך

The children of Sion, the priceless,
 Weighed against gold,²
 Are reckoned as earthenware pitchers,
 The work of the potter.

3. ך

The monsters³ draw out the breast
 And suckle their whelps,
But the daughters⁴ of my people are cruel
 As ostriches wild.

4. ך

Cleaves to the palate for thirst
 Tongue of the nursling.
 The children are begging for bread,
 None to dispense.

¹ Budde alters the reading to : *the precious stones*.

² As we say : “worth their weight in gold.”

³ Others : *jackals*.

⁴ So Bickell, reading בָּנֹת for בָּת.

5. 𐤍

They that were fed upon dainties
 Rot on the streets ;
 They who were nourished in scarlet
 Cling to the ashheaps.

6. 𐤍

The guilt of my people¹ exceeded
 The sins of Sēdōm,²
 Whose overthrow came in a flash
 Ere a hand could be wrung.³

7. 𐤍

Thy Nezīrīm were whiter than milk,
 More radiant than snow.⁴
 Ruddier than coral itself,
 And veined with the sapphire.⁵

8. 𐤍

Now darker than blackness their visage,
 Unknown as they pass,⁶
 Their skin drawn tight on their bones,
 Dry as a stick.

9. 𐤎

For the wounds of the sword are more kind
 Than the wounds of starvation,⁷
 They fester away who are stabbed
 By the dearth of the harvest.

¹ *Of the daughter of my people.*

² The Hebrew for Sodom.

³ Omit 𐤍𐤍.

⁴ In the original these two lines are reversed.

⁵ Literally : *sapphire their threading or filaments.*

⁶ Literally : *They are not recognized in the streets.*

⁷ Literally : *better are they who are stabbed with the sword than they who are stabbed by famine.*

10. י

The hands of the delicate women
 Have sodden their children,
 And these are come to be food,
 In the wreck of my people.

11. כ

God hath accomplished his fury,
 Exhausted his wrath,¹
 He kindled in Şion a fire
 That sapped her foundations.

12. ל

No kings of the earth had believed,
 No man in the world
 That foe or besieger could enter
 Jerusalem's gates.

13. מ

For the sins of her prophets *it was*,²
 For the crimes of her priests,
 They who had shed in her midst
 Blood of the just.

14. נ

They straggle like the blind in the streets,
 Polluted with blood.
 What they could not endure, they must *now*
 Sweep with their robes.

15. ס

"Bear off, ye unclean," men adjure them,
 "Bear off³ and avoid!"
 So they stagger and straggle about
 Homeless for ever!⁴

¹ Budde omits תְּרִין as too long for the line, but in the construct before נֶבֶל it has no accent, and therefore suits the Hebrew cadence. In the English, however, we must omit it.

² The Hebrew needs a third accented word.

³ Delete the second סִירֵי בְּנֵי־מָוֶת, which are too many for the lines. The latter, as Budde remarks, is senseless.

⁴ Literally: *They will no more become guests.*

16. ה

Jahweh himself hath dispersed them
 Out of his heeding,
 None to pay homage to the priests
 Nor court to the elders.

17. ו

We were straining, were training¹ our eyes
 Our help was a dream.
 While we looked for, we looked for a people
 That brought no relief.²

18. ז

They hunted our steps till we could not³
 Roam our own streets.
 Our days were cut short and completed,⁴
 Our end was come.

19. ח

Swifter were they that pursued us
 Than eagles of heaven.
 They hunted us over the mountains,
 They ambushed the desert.

20. ט

The breath of our life,⁵ God's anointed
 Was trapped in their toils,
 Of whom we had said, we shall live
 On in his shadow.⁶

21. י

Be glad and rejoice, O daughter of Edom,
 With a land to inhabit.
 To thee, too, the cup must pass round *till*
 Thou'rt drunk and dishevelled.

¹ There is a repetition here of the musical syllable ênu. "Odhênu tikhlenah 'enênu."

² The allusion is plainly to the failure of Egypt to bring relief.

³ Probably we should supply נַר or נַרִים in the Hebrew of this line.

⁴ Omit נַרִים as both obscure and superfluous for the rhythm.

⁵ Literally: *the breath of our nostrils*.

⁶ The Hebrew adds, *among the Gentiles*. The allusion in this verse is of course to the capture of Zedekiah.

22. 7

Daughter of Sion, thy guilt is exhausted,
No more shall he banish !
Daughter of Edom, he hath summed up thy guilt,
Thy sins are laid bare.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

THE AMORITE CALENDAR.

IN the February article under this title an attempt was made to collect the slight evidence which seemed to bear upon the identity of a calendar of months used in Babylonia, but apparently not Babylonian nor even Sumerian in origin. No attempt was made to go behind the published texts, except to guard against a too slavish acceptance of their first editions. Many of these texts are extremely difficult to read, but as scholars become more familiar with the handwriting of the cuneiform scribes, better results may be obtained, and every edition of fresh texts from the earlier periods of Babylonian history may be expected to produce fresh evidence bearing on the subject.

In the meantime, Dr. Th. Friedrich has published in full the texts of the tablets found by Professor V. Scheil at Sippara and now preserved in the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople. Many of these had been given, in transcription and translation only, in *Une Saison de fouilles à Sippar*, from which we have already quoted (p. 129), a method of publication which made it difficult to be sure of the original. Further, the rapidity with which such documents perish in their new surroundings warns us to make every effort to get them published before their evidence is once more, and finally, lost to the world. As might be expected, these *Altbabylonische Urkunden aus Sippara* give us welcome information on many points. Thus the cuneiform rendering of the Biblical Kittim has now been found, as *Ki-ti-im*, in the remarkable proviso inserted in the lease of a carriage for a year, viz., that it should not be used to go to Kittim. If this be really what is intended, we must suppose that such a journey from Babylonia to the coast of the Mediterranean sea was actually undertaken,

sometimes at any rate, in a carriage. This speaks volumes for the security of the roads under Hammurabi and his son Samsu-iluna, in whose eighth year this lease was drawn up. It further throws light upon the amount of intercourse between East and West when, not a Royal caravan nor an armed embassy, but a private citizen could contemplate such a journey.

In particular, these new texts furnish some welcome additions and corrections to what was available before. A further number of texts which will shortly be published, from the same place and period, afford welcome confirmations and enable us to take a step or two forward. They make certain the conjectured emendations of Dûr-Rammânu and Dûr-Abi into Isin-Rammânu and Isin-Abi. It may now be questioned whether these two months really belong to the "Amorite" calendar. They would be more in place in the "Early Sumerian" of Sargon I., given by Dr. H. Radau in his *Early Babylonian History* (p. 287 f.), where eight out of the nine month names already known begin with *EZEN*, or Isin. Surely this was a most priestly calendar, when each month was named after its festival. Now Dr. Radau has been able to fix these eight months with respect to their order and the corresponding later names are known. He has no name for Adar, Ab, or Marchesvan. Now we saw that Isin-Rammânu answered to Adar. If Isin-Abi is really connected with the month Ab, this should fill the blank fifth space in Dr. Radau's list. These suggestions must await further evidence before they are accepted, but amid the hundreds of unpublished deeds of Sargon's time, we may expect to find some dated in the months of Isin-Abi and Isin-Rammânu, names which at present are only found in deeds of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon. There we may also find the name of the month answering to the later Marchesvan.

We should thus lose two months out of our former "Amorite" calendar, but their transference to the "Early Sumerian" calendar clearly does not affect the placing of the other months nor the attribution of them to an "Amorite" source. Thus, for example, Mamîtu still precedes Adar and answers to Šebat, but it is not transferred to the "Early Sumerian" calendar, for the month there preceding Adar is already known to be *EZEN-AMAR-A-SI*. Again, the removal of Isin-Abi from the "Amorite" calendar is a great relief, as we now have room for Šadûtu with which we found it to be equivalent. This month then clearly answers to Abu. We are still left with the difficulty that if Elûlu be the same as Ulûlu, Tiru should be Ab. The suggestion already made (p. 128) that Elûlu may be the "Amorite" name for Tišrî would solve the difficulty, but we must wait for more evidence.

In compensation for the lost months, Dr. Friedrich's new texts bring us at least one fresh name, apparently Šelaša (Sipp. 323, l. 6), which does not belong to the other calendars and which we may therefore add provisionally to the "Amorite" list. In the cuneiform documents, the name of the month Ab is spelt A-bu (genitive, A-bi); Dr. Friedrich, however, publishes a text (Sipp. 355, l. 10) dated in the month Ab-bi, which he regards as a mere variant for Abi. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the text to fix the month. It is just possible that we have here the "Amorite" name answering to Abib. It is not likely that there is any connexion between Abu and Abib, and although the year may once have begun in Adar, as it certainly did begin in Tišrî in the time of Gudea, it is difficult to see what shifting of epoch could bring Ab to Abib. On the other hand we do not yet know the meaning of the month name Abu, while Abib is supposed to refer to the "opening of flowers," etc., in other words is given a Hebrew deriva-

tion. If this derivation of Abib be correct, the form Abbi would answer to it very well. Until, however, we have evidence to show that Abbi is not for Abi, or to show that Abbi answered to some other month than Ab, we cannot press the point. If Abib really answered to the later Nisân, we already know that the "Amorite" name for that month was Rabûtu, not Abbi.

Dr. Friedrich's edition shows that the unusual word *idar* (p. 129), whose meaning was conjectured from the context to be the same as *irûb* (p. 128), is actually *irûb* on the original; thus bringing this text into complete parallelism with the others. He also shows that Šubutim is the correct reading here; and not Subutim as was conjectured (p. 129).

The period at which this race of Amorites settled in Babylonia is not yet ascertained. Some writers have apparently assumed that because the First Dynasty of Babylon was Amorite the invasion of Babylonia by the Amorites should be placed not long before. In the time of Sargon I., king of Akkad, usually dated about B.C. 3800 on the authority of Nabonidus the antiquary king of Babylon, numerous references are made to the land of Martu, usually identified with Amurru. These are taken to refer to the same Western land as was designated by the same name in the time of Sennacherib. That we know by its inclusion of Tyre, Arvad, Gebal, Gaza, Ekron, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Samsimuruna, Judah, Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc., to be Western Syria and Palestine, extending across the Jordan. Sargon's conquests in the West are therefore taken to mean an Empire bounded by the Mediterranean on the West. Doubt has, however, been thrown on this view since Dr. T. G. Pinches and others pointed out the existence of the Amurri and a land of Martu in the vicinity of Babylon. We may ask, "Had the location of the name

and race changed ? ” It seems possible that the “ Amorites,” who once, in Sargon’s time, were settled in the West, had now reached Babylonia in such numbers as to give their name to a district there. This view was held by many, but in the *Revue Semitique* (1897, p. 166 f.) Mr. Thureau Danguin published part of a land survey from Telloh, probably connected with the purchase of large estates for the Crown, which mentioned a governor of the land of Martu, with the distinctly West Semitic name of Uru-malik. This man occupied the same position as Rim Sin in the time of Hammurabi, and as the monument is dated on palaeographical grounds even anterior to Sargon I. we must recognize that the Amorites in the time of Sargon I. were not only in the West but also in great force in Babylonia itself. That the native Babylonians do not call the First Dynasty of Babylon “ Amorite ” is more easily accounted for, considering the Amorite complexion of the monarchs’ names, if we suppose that the Amorites were already ancient inhabitants.

We may now ask whether there is any evidence of the “ Amorite ” calendar in Babylonia before the days of the First Dynasty. In an article published in the *Revue d’Assyriologie* (iv. p. 84) Mr. Thureau Danguin drew attention to the fact that, in the time of Sargon I., alongside of the dating by the month names which we have called “ Early Sumerian,” dates were given in months whose names were *Bahir arkû*, *Zabittu*, and *Hanî*. These are evidently Semitic, but not translations of the Early Sumerian, Sumerian, or Babylonian month names. One of these names at once strikes us as Amorite, *Zabittu* is surely the same as *Zibittu*, *Sibutu*, etc. The name *Bahir arkû* denotes an intercalary *Bahir*, as *Addaru arkû* denotes *Ve-Adar*. This fact apparently led Dr. Radau to identify *Bahir* with *Adar*, but there were in early times other inter-

calary months, a second Nisan, a second Elul, and there really seems to be no reason why an intercalary month should not have been inserted whenever needed. At any rate, the mere fact that the month is intercalary does not identify it with Adar more than Nisan or Elul. The word Baḥir seems to be connected with the word *bahru*, which means a "brazier" or "censer." Now this is also the meaning of the "Amorite" month name Kinûnu, which, if the same as the Canaanite Kanun, answers to the later Marchesvan. In view of the fact that the whole of the Early Sumerian calendar refers to festivals, it would be unwise to conclude that this month was called the "brazier" because the weather was especially "hot" in that part of the year. The reference may rather be to some festival in which the "brazier," or "censer," bore a prominent part. The Phoenician month name Marzeaḥ seems to have been taken from some festival (see G. A. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 95, 121 f., 303), and this festival had a wide vogue among the West Semites. Without prejudice to the questions whether Marzeaḥ was the name of a whole month or only of the five epagomenous days of the year or rather of the festival held during them, and without deciding upon its place in the year, we may remark that *maṣraḥu*, a term often occurring in dates of the First Dynasty of Babylon, is a very similar word. The root *ṣarâḥu* means "to cry aloud," as would the root *razâḥu* from which Marzeaḥ would be derived in Babylonia. It is tempting to suppose that Marzeaḥ originally meant exactly the same as *maṣraḥu*. The exact meaning of this word is not known, but its ideogram *GIŠ-KU-ŠU-NIR* seems to connect it with *ŠU-NIR*, the ideogram of *Šurinnu*, which does mean "brazier" or "censer," as do both the month names Baḥir and Kinûnu. It would be hasty to conclude that Marzeaḥ was a month and identical with Baḥir and Kinûnu, and, therefore, fell

in Marchesvan ; but it seems scarcely likely that all this is mere coincidence. Whether a festival could be shifted from one month to another is very doubtful, but it could give its name to the month in which it fell, and months were apparently shifted ; whether as the result of the want of means to keep the lunar and solar year in harmony, or from other considerations now obscure to us. On the question of the shifting of months see Dr. H. Radau's *Early Babylonian History* (p. 287 ff.).

There does not seem to be any Babylonian root likely to lead to the month name Ḫanî, though it is not well to be too dogmatic on such a point while such a small proportion of the material already in our museums is published ; but the word is exactly like many elements of West Semitic names and it may not be too presumptuous to suppose that it meant the "month of favour." This is the meaning usually ascribed to the name Šadûtu, on the ground of words preserved in Assyrian letters of the seventh century B.C., which may themselves be due to West Semitic influence. It would be too much to say that Šadûtu was a Babylonian word because a derivation could be found in the Assyrian dictionaries. Both Ḫanî and Šadûtu may be "Amorite" names ; but that they seem to have the same meaning suggests the identity of the months indicated by them.

Whatever may ultimately be proved for these months, and it will be noted that as yet they are "single instances" and we have no documentary evidence as to what part of the year they fell in, it seems probable that "Amorite" best describes their affinities. It is certain that they are not translations of the names of the other calendars in use at the same period. We may say that these "Amorite" names go back to the time of Sargon I. It remains to be seen whether the other names we have called "Amorite"

occur so early. It would have been disconcerting for our theory if we had to assume that the Amorites first appeared in Babylonia in the 23rd century B.C. But we have seen that they were in Babylonia at least as early as the time of Sargon I. How many more of these "Amorite" months are named in the hundreds of tablets of that early period already in our Museums we cannot say yet.

The much abused Cappadocian tablets, which witness to the use of cuneiform script in the far West, about Caesarea and Boghaz Keui, mention months unknown elsewhere. Professor Delitzsch, who first made their contents intelligible, is inclined on palaeographic and other grounds to place them as early as the 23rd century B.C. They have many affinities with Assyria, as in the method of dating by the *limmu*, or Eponymy, exactly as in the Assyrian Eponym Canon, the occurrence of many personal names compounded with Ašur, etc. The list of month names which Delitzsch (in the *Abhandlungen der philol. histor. Classe der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, xiv. no. iv. pp. 207–270) rescues for us comprises Biḳawarta, Zizuim, Zaratim, Ab Šarâni and Kuzallu. The last we have already met with (p. 131) in Assyria and Palmyra. The name Ab Šarâni can scarcely be identified with Ab until we know in what part of the year it fell. Zaratim looks Semitic at any rate. The others do not seem to have any connexion with the "Amorite" calendar, but may be borne in mind. The tablets, however, still sorely need a critical edition of their texts and these names may ultimately turn out to be quite different in form from what Delitzsch has given as the best that can be made of the present editions.

In the land of Ḫana, wherever that may be, cuneiform writing was also in use. Mr. Thureau Danguin has published in his *Tablettes chaldéennes inédites* (no. 85) a tablet from Ḫana where Assyrian influence was also strong, as is

shown by the use of the homer as a measure of grain, a measure hitherto unrecognized on Babylonian soil. The homer is also West Semitic, and the names in the text show the same complexion, one Išarlim, that of the king of Ḫana, being regarded by many as an exact equivalent of Israel. This tablet is dated in the month Teritim, a name which at once recalls the "Amorite" Tiru. It would bear the same relation to it that the Babylonian Tašrîtum bears to Tišrî. If this be really the same month, it is a further argument against the reading Tirinu already doubted (p. 129). Dr. Friedrich's texts also support Tiru. The aberrant *-nu* may be an error for *-tum*.

It is, of course, unfortunate that we cannot yet present a full list of the months of the "Amorite" calendar, nor even fix the sequence of those we know. We do not yet know that there may not be some which will have to follow Dûr-Rammânu and Dûr-Abi. It might have been wiser to wait till we knew more before saying anything about them, but such as it is this tentative list may guide some one to further research and even lead to the recognition of month names in places where they have not yet been suspected.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.*¹

XXXVII. THE APOCALYPTIC TEACHING OF JESUS, XIII.

THE last period of the public ministry of Jesus was followed as on earlier occasions by a time of private instruction to the disciples. The text of the discourse was a question from one of them ; as they left the Temple for the last time, this disciple was struck with its grandeur, especially with the massive stones used in its construction, and exclaimed, "See, Teacher, what wonderful stones ! what wonderful buildings !" Jesus took the opportunity of declaring the coming end of the old dispensation ; taking up His follower's words, He spoke first of the Temple, the centre and symbol of Judaism. "Are you looking at these great buildings ?" said He. "Not one stone shall be left upon another ; all shall be pulled down." At the moment He said no more, but when they had left the city, and were sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the Temple, the four disciples who belonged to the inner circle—Peter, James, John, and Andrew—asked Him privately when these things would happen, and what would be the sign of their imminence. In answer to this question Jesus unfolded His teaching as to the course of events after His death. Here again He appealed to the current Jewish beliefs, and His answer is largely a recapitulation of the signs and circumstances of the Day of the Lord as they were set forth in the Old Testament and in later Jewish literature, including apparently the Book of Enoch, in which the Son of Man is a conspicuous figure. The discourse might almost be called

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

a summary of the wide-spread popular apocalyptic teaching of the times. Similar summaries may have been current amongst the Jews, and Jesus may have adapted to His own special purpose some well known miniature apocalypse. Now as ever He is loyal to the revelation made to Israel; He claims that it is fulfilled in Himself and His mission; and He holds to the old faith as interpreted in the new light of His own experience, an experience so profound and penetrating as to constitute a new Revelation. The national and political elements have disappeared, together with the warrior king winning carnal victories by fleshly armies, and instead we have: "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory, and then shall He send forth the angels and gather the elect from the four winds from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven."

The Day of the Lord is removed to an indefinite, though not utterly remote, future: "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things happen. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away. But concerning that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, not even the Son—only the Father."

In these last days of Jesus, in this final crisis, the frail body was quick with a life almost too intense for flesh and blood to contain; every faculty of mind and spirit was strained to the utmost, and there must have been marvellous workings in that debateable land of human personality, where nerves and senses blend with memory and imagination, hope and fear, faith and doubt. The teaching of Jesus shows that He often thought in pictures and parables, and that His mind was stored with images from prophetic and apocalyptic visions. These images are not aesthetic furniture of the mind, or even mere symbols; they were forms in which Jesus realized experiences of self,

and man, and God. Thus when His victorious spirit pierced the thick gloom of the present, and the Son of Man saw Himself triumphant in some vague unknown future, what He beheld were the visions of ancient Hebrew seers realized in His own Person.

XXXVIII. SCHEMES FOR THE ARREST OF JESUS,

XIV. 1, 2, 10, 11.

As after the Transfiguration, the scene changes abruptly from ecstatic visions to the deadly hatred of the enemies of Jesus, and the failure of His disciples. As day after day went by and the Passover came nearer and nearer, the overthrow of Jesus became a more and more urgent necessity for the Jewish officials in Jerusalem. They had to regain control of the Temple in order that the supreme festival of their religion might be properly observed; they had also to remove Jesus from the scene in order that the Galilean fanatic—as they esteemed Him—might not throw the city into an uproar by playing upon the excited enthusiasm of the thronging crowds of worshippers. If they left Him alone now, they might be forced to deal with Him during the feast when His arrest would be certain to cause a tumult. Even now it would be safer to come upon Him unawares, apart from the multitude, and take Him quietly. With this end in view they sought anxiously for a suitable opportunity, and Providence, as it seemed to them, came to their assistance in the very nick of time. Only two days before the Passover the priests were agreeably surprised by a visit from one of His intimate followers, who offered to betray the Master into their hands. A bargain was soon struck, and the traitor, Judas Iscariot by name, one of the Twelve, promised to find some occasion on which the priests could quietly and safely seize Jesus. From that moment he was

constantly listening and watching for information that would enable him to betray his master.

St. Mark does not tell us why Judas became a traitor ; but there were many causes at work which tended to alienate from Jesus even His most devoted followers. The devotion of all His disciples was tainted with personal ambition ; the sons of Zebedee, two of the innermost circle, and sought pre-eminence in the Kingdom of God by underhand means, and their conduct had been bitterly resented by their comrades. Judas no doubt shared the secular ambitions of his fellows, and expected wealth, power and honour for himself from the triumph of Jesus. When Jesus time after time threw away His opportunities, Judas no doubt felt that his own personal interests were being sacrificed, and his devotion waned and gave place to ill-will and resentment. The disillusionings of these final days in Jerusalem brought matters to a climax ; Judas saw the last and greatest opportunities wasted ; he and his fellows, it seemed, would not share the triumph of a Messiah, but the punishment of an impostor. In any case Jesus was doomed, and Judas might as well save himself by delivering Him up to the authorities. Had he not deluded His followers with false hopes ? Was He not leading them as sheep to the slaughter ?

XXXIX. THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY, XIV. 3-9.

The story of malice and treachery is interrupted that the Evangelist may tell of a woman's passionate devotion to Jesus. The scene changes to Bethany, and we read how, while the priests were plotting His death, Jesus sat at supper in the house of one Simon the Leper. The generous sympathy that had made Him the guest of publicans and sinners had brought Him now to the table of a leper ! While they

were at supper the neighbours might take advantage of the easy access to an Eastern guestchamber to gratify their curiosity by staring at the Prophet and His followers. Amongst these onlookers was a woman with a small jar, who made her way to Jesus, broke the jar, and poured its contents over His head. As she did so the room was filled with the odour of precious ointment, and the eyes of all turned to her and to Jesus. The loving reverence of faithful disciples would understand her enthusiasm, and would welcome her deed as an act of due homage, the anointing of the Messianic Priest and King; but other spectators were cold and indifferent; the personality of Jesus did not move them from sober, practical, prosaic views; they were indignant at the waste of good ointment; some perhaps annoyed at the fuss which the woman was making over this very doubtful prophet; others not grudging the tribute to the Master, but calm and detached enough to realize that anointing with a moderate amount of ordinary oil would have served her purpose, and would have been more seemly and convenient for Jesus. If the good woman must get rid of her ointment, she might have sold it and given away the price to the poor. Possibly some poor folk, deserving at any rate in their own estimation, had edged their way into the room, and were there to illustrate and applaud the sentiment. The act might affect them as needy spectators might have been moved by the sight of Cleopatra drinking her dissolved pearls. Some of the company, as they recovered from the shock they had sustained, began to reproach the woman; but Jesus interposed in a tone of melancholy irony:—

“Let her alone. Why do you trouble her? She has done well what she has done for me. You have the poor always with you, and can help them whenever you choose.”

If there was any sincerity in this cheap anxiety that some

one else's money should be given to the poor, they would have ample opportunity for exercising their benevolence.

“But me you have not always.”

The few short hours in which human ministry could soothe and relieve Him were fast slipping away ; the words express His feeling of isolation, His disappointment at the failure of the disciples to understand Him, His baffled yearning for sympathy.

“She has done what she could ; she has anointed my body beforehand for burial.”

He ironically re-assures those who thought this more than royal and more than priestly anointing an undue honour. They need not be alarmed. At the same time He quenches the sanguine exultation of any who held it to be the happy omen of His speedy enthronement as the Messiah. It was not really the prelude to His triumphant installation as Priest and King, but only a funeral rite performed a little before its time lest there should be no opportunity for honourable obsequies. He spoke as a dying man who knows that his hours are numbered.

He ended with a word of praise for the woman : “Wherever the Gospel is preached throughout the whole world, she shall be remembered, and men shall tell the story of what she did for me.”

The incident marks the growing coldness and indifference to Jesus even amongst His own followers. From this scene Judas Iscariot went away to betray His Master.

XL. THE PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER, XIV. 14-16.

At last the slow hours brought the morning of the day on which the Passover lamb was killed and eaten. Jesus had maintained so much reserve that His followers knew little of His plans and had not even been told where He intended to hold the Passover meal ; so they asked Him,

“Where do you wish us to go and prepare for eating the Passover?” As the Passover was a family celebration this question implied that the Master and His disciples formed a family. Jesus’ answer reminds us of the circumstances of His ride into Jerusalem; we get another glimpse of relations between Jesus and adherents who were not closely connected with His usual companions. With these adherents, on this occasion also, He had made secret arrangements without the knowledge of the Apostles. He bade two of the disciples go into the city; there they would meet a man carrying a pitcher of water. Probably Jesus gave them other signs by which they might recognize this man. They were to follow him home, and say to the master of the house, “The Teacher saith, Where is my guestchamber in which I am to eat the Passover with my disciples?” Then he would show them a large upper room, furnished and ready; and there the two disciples were to prepare the meal.

The disciples went into the city, found all as Jesus had told them, and made ready the Passover.

Jesus was anxious that this meal with his followers should not be interrupted; He knew there was treachery even amongst the Twelve; and by these precautions He secured one last season of quiet fellowship.

W. H. BENNETT.

TARSUS, THE RIVER AND THE SEA.

IV.

THE glory and the ornament of Tarsus was the river Cydnus, which flowed through the middle of the city. Dion Chrysostom, in the first of his two orations delivered at Tarsus somewhere about A.D. 110, makes fun of the pride and affection with which the Tarsians regarded their river; they loved to hear from strangers the praises of its beauty and of the clearness of its water, and they anxiously explained to visitors the reason, when it flowed dark and muddy. He speaks rather depreciatingly of the situation and natural surroundings of Tarsus, and declares that it is inferior to many cities in respect of river and climate and conformation of land and sea and harbour and walls.¹ The river, which flows clear and bright among the hills, soon grows muddy after it enters the rich deep soil of the plain. Dion implies that its water was ordinarily clear as it flowed through the city; and this was certainly the case. In its short course through the thin soil north of the city it did not come much in contact with the mud, but flowed in a wide gravelly bed. Only when in flood did it carry down with it mud and soil, and flow through the city in a dark and turbid current. But below the city, where the soil is deeper, it soon becomes laden with mud, and acquires permanently the yellowish opaque colour of the Tiber at Rome.

The question as to the character of the bed of the Cydnus is complicated by the change that has occurred in the course of the river. It was liable to inundation, as it drained a large extent of hill and mountain country, down which its numerous feeders rushed rapidly after heavy rain

¹ The reading is uncertain in some details, but the general sense is clear.

and poured a sudden flood into the city. Probably the danger was guarded against during the most prosperous period of Tarsian history by operations facilitating the outflow. At least Dion, while he refers to the turbid colour of the river in flood, does not mention the danger of inundation in his very candid and searching enumeration of the natural defects of the city. Afterwards less care was shown in keeping the channel clear and open, and in the time of Justinian, between 527 and 563 A.D., a flood did so much harm to the city, that the Emperor formed a new channel in which the river now flows. Probably this channel was intended merely to divert the superabundant water, for the purpose of making the river within the city uniform and safe. But the result was that, in the neglectful times which followed, the channel within the city gradually became choked, and the whole body of water was diverted into the new course. It was not till about the fourteenth or fifteenth century that the process was completed. Earlier travellers saw the river flowing in part through the city, in which its channel can still be traced (especially in the southern parts) by the depression in the level, and by remains of the embankments and bridges seen by living witnesses during excavations for building purposes. The modern watercourse on the west side of the town, often mistaken by travellers for the original course of the river, is wholly artificial and quite distinct from the old channel (as can be seen by following it up to the point, where it is taken off from the Cydnus).

It was not necessary for Justinian to make a new channel all the way to the sea. A watercourse flowed down parallel to the Cydnus past the eastern side of the city. All that was necessary was to make a cutting from the Cydnus, beginning from a point about a mile north of the modern town, and diverging gradually from it towards the other

bed, which it joins on the east side of the modern city. This watercourse was too small for the large body of water that afterwards came to run through it ; and hence in modern times there are annual floods and great part of the country south of the city is sometimes inundated. In May, 1902, we could hardly make our way down by the west side of the Cydnus towards the sea, and the horses had to wade a long distance through fairly deep water that covered the fields.

The artificial character of the channel in which the Cydnus now flows on the north and north-east sides of the city is plainly shown in the so-called " Falls of the Cydnus," a little below the point where the modern course diverges from the ancient bed. The rocks over which the stream falls contain numerous ancient graves, and many of these are underneath the ordinary level of the water and visible only when the river is at its lowest.

While the river in its modern course never touches the city, and artificial canals carry the water to irrigate the gardens and turn the cotton mills and other machinery in Tarsus, the ancient Cydnus flowed right through the city. Strabo, Dion, Xenophon, and other authorities agree in this statement. About two miles or less below the city there is formed in the wet season a small lake, which generally disappears in summer. This lake forms in a slight depression on the former bed of the river, as the flow of the water is impeded by modern conditions ; but no such lake was permitted to form when Tarsus was a great ancient city.

About five or six miles below the modern town the Cydnus flowed into a lake. This lake is fed by natural springs in its bed (as I was informed by good authorities), and must always have existed. Its ancient name was Rhegmoi or Rhegma ; and the name must be taken as a proof that it was at one time a lagoon, into which the sea broke over a

bar of sand. Thus at some remote period, the memory of which was preserved by the name, the river had no proper mouth to discharge itself into the sea (resembling in this respect the Sarus, as described in Section III.) But in the time of Strabo, and doubtless for centuries previously, the lake was separate from the sea, and communicated with it only through the lower course of the river. Strabo describes the lake as a widening of the river. There was doubtless then, as now, a belt of sand and dunes between the lake and the sea, though it remains uncertain whether the belt was as broad then as it now is.

This lake was the harbour of Tarsus. Here were the docks and arsenal. Here most ships discharged, though light galleys, like that which carried Cleopatra, could be navigated up into the heart of the city. Round three sides of the lake, probably, extended the harbour town, which was called Aulai.¹ The city did not extend to the southern side of the lake; not a trace could be seen of a city on that side; but the buildings extended in an almost unbroken succession from the lake to the city.

The conformation of the country shows that the Cydnus must have flowed in a comparatively straight course southwards through the plain into the lake. The exact line of its old channel cannot always be traced, but its general course is evident. In the centre of the city, however, it made a sharp bend eastwards for a short distance, and then turned south again. Its old channel in this bend is quite clearly visible within the modern town; and a more careful survey

¹ It is an error of Ritter's to call the harbour town Anchialos. The sole foundation for the great geographer's opinion seems to lie in the derivation *ἄγχι ἁλός*, "near the sea." The references of the ancients show clearly that Anchialos was about 12 miles south-west of Tarsus on the road to Soloi-Pompeiopolis, and a little way inland from Zephyrion, which was situated at Kara-Duwar, on the coast about two miles east from Mersina, the modern harbour which has taken the place of Zephyrion.

might suffice to place its whole course on a map with exact certainty.

The Cydnus flows with a much swifter current down a far less level course than the Sarus. The railway which passes a short mile north of Tarsus is a few feet higher above the sea at Tarsus than at Adana (63 feet), and therefore, while the Sarus has a meandering course of 50 or 60 miles from Adana to the sea, the Cydnus falls a little more in its course of about 11 miles. But the fall is greatest above the city, less within it and far less below it. Even the upper lake or marsh cannot be much above sea level, and the lower permanent lake is probably little, if at all, higher than sea level except when it is swollen by rains and by overflow from the modern river on the east.

At an early period of history a great deal of labour and skill must have been expended on the channel of the Cydnus and on the lake in order to regulate and limit them, and to improve the navigation. The once useless lagoon was converted into a convenient harbour, open to ships through the lower course of the river, yet completely shut in and safe against sudden attack from the sea. Nature had aided the work by forming a broader belt of sandy sea shore and transforming the lagoon into a lake. But engineering skill was required to improve the lower course of the river, to facilitate its flow and prevent inundation, to deepen and embank the channel and to drain the marshes, as well as to border the lake with the quays and dockyards which Strabo describes. The lake was certainly smaller in ancient times than it now is, and proportionately deeper. The river probably issued from it at the south-eastern end and found its way into the sea through the same mouth as at the present day, though the present communication from the lake and the modern river is by a cutting a hundred yards or more north of the probable former channel of the river.

This brief survey shows what was the foundation on which rested the love and pride with which the Tarsians regarded their river. The Cydnus is very far from being a beautiful or a grand stream. Nature has not originally seemed kind to Tarsus. Nothing can be drearier or more repellent than the stretch of land and river between the city and the sea, as the modern traveller beholds it. No amount of skill could ever make it beautiful. Dion certainly was thoroughly justified when he said to the Tarsians that as regards natural surroundings and advantages, they were inferior to numberless cities. But their river was their own in the sense that their own skill and energy had made it. They had transformed that dreary stretch of half-inundated lands, fringed by sand heaps along the sea, into a rich, well drained and well watered plain, holding in its bosom a vast city through which ran for miles a river capacious of the merchandise of many lands—a city with its feet resting on a great inland harbour and its head reaching up to the hills.

This is only one of the numberless cases in the ancient world in which a great engineering operation lies far away back at the beginning of the history of a city or a district. The effort and the struggle for victory over nature in such cases seem to have started the population on a career of success, teaching them to combine and to organize the work of many for a common benefit, and showing in the result how union and toil could make their city great and its inhabitants respected.

When once the Cydnus had been regulated and navigation made possible, Tarsus was placed in a very favourable situation. It was (as Thucydides says) a necessity for the early trading cities that they should lie at some distance from the sea in order to be safe from pirates. Tarsus was situated at the head of the navigation of a river, which it

had by its own work and skill made navigable ; and it took full advantage of its position. Though not most favourably situated by nature to be the distributing centre for Cilicia, and the road centre for communication with other lands, it entered into competition with its rivals that were more favoured by nature, and by another great piece of engineering placed itself in command of the best route from Cilicia to the north and north-west across the Taurus mountains. Tarsus cut the great pass, called the Cilician Gates, one of the most famous and the most important passes in history.

V. TARSUS AND THE CILICIAN GATES.

The broad and lofty ridge of the Taurus mountains divides Cilicia on the south from Cappadocia and Lycaonia on the north. The Taurus is cut obliquely from north-west to south-east by a glen, down which flows a river called Tehakut Su, rising in Cappadocia and joining the Sarus in Cilicia near Adana. The glen of the Tehakut water offers a natural road, easy and gently sloping through the heart of Taurus. It is generally a very narrow gorge, deep down amid the lofty mountains ; but it opens out into two small valleys, one near the northern end, the Vale of Loulon or Halala, 3,600 feet above the sea, the other about the middle of its course, the Vale of Podandus, 2,800 feet. At the east end of the Vale the glen is narrowed to a mere slit barely wide enough to receive the Tehakut water, and the road has to cross a hill ridge for about four or five miles. Apart from this there is no difficulty, until, a few miles south-east from the Vale of Podandus, the glen ends before the southern ridge of Taurus, which rises high above it like a broad, lofty, unbroken wall. The river Tehakut finds an underground passage through this wall ; and the railway will in some future age traverse it by a tunnel, and

emerge on the foot hills in front of Taurus, and so come down on Adana. But the road has to climb over this great wall, and nature has provided no easy way to do this. The earliest road, which is still not altogether disused, went on south-eastwards to Adana direct, ascending the steep ridge and descending again on the southern side: it has never been anything but a hill path, fit for horses but not for vehicles.

This was the path by which Mallos and Adana originally maintained their communication and trade with the Central Plateau of Anatolia.

The enterprise of the Tarsians opened up a waggon road direct to their own city. A path, which was in use doubtless from the earliest time, leaves the Tchakut glen at Podandus (2,800 feet) and ascends by the course of a small stream, keeping a little west of south till it reaches and crosses the bare broad summit (4,300 feet) where Ibrahim Pasha's Lines were constructed in the war of 1839, then it descends sharply 500 feet beside another small stream till it reaches a sheer wall of rock through which the stream finds its way in a narrow gorge, the Cilician Gates. Nature had made this gorge just wide enough to carry the water, and the rocks rise steep on both sides to the height of 500 or 600 feet. Except in flood, men and animals could easily traverse the rough bed of this small stream. But the pass began to be important only when the Tarsians built a waggon road over the difficult hills to the southern end of the Gates, and then cut with the chisel a level path out of the solid rock on the west bank of the stream. Thus the "Cilician Gates" became the one waggon road from Cilicia across the Taurus, and remained the only waggon road until the Romans (probably under Septimius Severus, about 200-210 A.D.) made another from Corycus by Olba to Laranda.

We naturally ask at what period these great engineering works were achieved ; but no direct evidence is attainable except that a waggon road leading south across Taurus from Tyana was in existence before the march of the Ten Thousand (401 B.C.), and this waggon road must necessarily be the road through the Cilician Gates. For my own part, though strict evidence has not been discovered and certainly is unattainable, I feel confident that the waggon way through the Cilician Gates had been cut, and a permanent frontier guard stationed there, centuries before that time. The probability that this was so will appear in the following sections.

It may be added that Herodotus v. 52 describes the guardhouses at the frontier between Cappadocia and Cilicia on the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa. Now, the Royal Road in reality must have taken the more direct northerly route across Anti-Taurus to the Euphrates, traversing the district of Cilicia north of Taurus. But Herodotus erroneously supposed that the Cilicia which the Royal Road traversed was Cilicia by the sea (as appears from his words in v. 49) ; and the detailed description which he gives of the guardhouses at the Cilician frontier was applicable to the Cilician Gates, through which he must have supposed that the Royal Road went. I see here a proof that the importance of this pass had called for a permanent guard when Herodotus was gathering information in preparation for his history. This takes back the cutting of the Gates at least as early as the first half of the fifth century ; and the indirect considerations to be stated below carry us further back still.

This survey of the natural conditions by which Tarsian development was controlled has brought out clearly that the great history of the city was not due to the excellent qualities of river, climate, sea or harbour placed at its dis-

posal with lavish kindness by nature. In those respects it was inferior, as Dion says, to very many cities. It had subdued nature to its purposes, it had made for itself river and harbour and access to the sea, and a great engineered road across the mountains; and it could compensate through the kindness of nature the stifling moist heat of the plain by the lighter and cooler atmosphere of the hills or the sharper air of the upper Taurus regions. It had learned to conquer nature by observing the laws and methods of nature. It was the men that had made the city.

Such was the great inheritance which they bequeathed to their descendants. An inheritance of the fruit of courage and energy like this is a great thing for a people, and a just cause for pride: the Tarsians of the later Greek and Roman times were stimulated and strengthened by the consciousness of their inheritance from the men of earlier times. That is clearly implied by the language of Strabo and Dion; and it is expressed in the words of St. Paul.

Clear evidence of Paul's deep feeling about his Tarsian home may be seen in the account which Luke gives of one of the most terrible scenes in his life, when, bruised and at the point of death, he was rescued from the clutches of a fanatical and exasperated Jewish crowd by the Roman soldiers. If we imagine what his condition must have been, sore from his blows and the pulling asunder of his rescuers and of the mob, probably bleeding, certainly excited and breathless, the shouts of the crowd still dinning in his ears, "Away with him," as they strove to get hold of him again, his life hanging on the steadfast discipline of the soldiers and the goodwill of their commander—we must feel that at this supreme moment, when the Roman tribune hurriedly questioned him as to his race and language, he would not waste his words in stating mere picturesque details: anything that rose to his lips in this crisis of strong excite-

ment and emotion must have been something that lay near his heart, or something that was calculated to determine his rescuer's conduct. He said: "I am Jew, Tarsian of Cilicia, citizen of no mean city." This was not his strict legal designation in the Roman Empire, for he was a Roman citizen, and that proud description superseded all humbler characteristics. Nor was the Tarsian designation the one best calculated to move the Roman tribune to grant the request which Paul was about to make; that officer was far more likely to grant the request of a Roman than of a Tarsian Jew. Nor had Paul any objection to claiming his Roman rights, for he shortly afterwards claimed them at the Tribune's hand.

It seems impossible to explain Paul's reply on this occasion except that "Tarsian" was the description of himself which lay closest to his heart, and was uttered in his excitement. And, especially, the praise of Tarsus as a famous city is hardly capable of any other interpretation than that, in his deeply stirred emotional condition, he gave expression to the patriotism and love which he really felt for his fatherland and the home of his early years.

It is not impossible now, and there is no reason to think it was impossible then, for a Jew of the Diaspora to entertain a distinct and strong feeling of loyalty towards the city where he was born and in which he possessed the rights of citizenship. It must be remembered that the feeling of an ancient citizen to his own city was much stronger than that which is in modern times entertained usually toward one's native town. All the feeling of patriotism which now binds us to our country, irrespective of the town to which we belong, was in ancient times directed towards one's city. "Fatherland" denoted one's city, and not one's country. Both *Patria* in Latin, and *Patris* in Greek, were

applied to the city of one's home.¹ It was only to a small degree, and among the most educated Greeks, that Hellas, as a country, was an idea of power. The educated native of a Cilician city like Tarsus regarded the country Cilicia as implying rudeness and barbarism, and prided himself on being a Hellene rather than a Cilician; but Hellas to him meant a certain standard and ideal of culture and municipal freedom. He was a "Tarsian," but Tarsus was, and had long been, a Hellenic city; and the Greek-speaking Tarsians were either Hellenes or Jews, but not Cilicians.

Moreover, citizenship implied much more in ancient times than it means now. We can now migrate to a new city, and almost immediately acquire citizenship there, losing in it our former home. But in ancient days the Tarsian who migrated to another city continued to rank as a Tarsian, and Tarsus was still his fatherland, while in his new home he was merely a resident alien. His descendants, too, continued to be mere resident aliens. Occasionally, and as a special compliment, a resident alien was granted the citizenship with his descendants; but a special enactment was needed in each individual case and family.

The city that was his fatherland and his home mattered much to Paul. It had a place in his heart. He was proud of its greatness. He thought of the men who had made it and bequeathed it to his time as men connected by certain ties with himself (Rom. i. 14).

Who were those men? Of what stock was the people who thus made their own river and harbour?

VI. THE IONIANS IN EARLY TARSUS.

According to the view stated in the preceding pages, the

¹ To a certain degree the Roman Imperial régime succeeded in widening the scope of the term *patria*. That is one of the many advances which it enabled the world to make. It gave to men the power to feel that their Fatherland was their country and not their narrow township.

formation of that important pass over Taurus, one of the great triumphs of early civilization over the conditions of nature, was simply a stage in the long struggle between Tarsus and its pair of allied rivals, Mallos with Adana,¹ for control of the markets of the country. From this point of view it becomes clear also that Tarsus first became a harbour and a sea power, and afterwards proceeded to open up the land road as a means of developing its commerce.

The conformity of the facts, as thus stated, with the character of Greek trading enterprise at numberless points round the Mediterranean and Black Seas, is striking. Surely the development of Tarsus must imply a mixture of Greek blood and race in the city. This idea is confirmed and definitely proved by the fact that the first station north of Tarsus, on the way to the Gates, bore the name of Mopsoukrene, the Fountain of Mopsus. Mopsus was the religious impersonation and expression of the expansive energy of the Greek colonies on the Cilician and the neighbouring Pamphylian and Syrian coasts. Such colonies always went forth under divine guidance, and this guidance regularly proceeded from a single centre, viz., one of the centres of prophetic inspiration which the Greeks called Oracles. In the best known period of Greek history the Delphic Oracle was the chief agent in directing the streams of Greek overflow and colonization in the various lines along which it spread. But the Cilician colonies were founded at an earlier time, when the Delphic Oracle had not yet established such a widespread influence, and the divine guidance proceeded from an Ionian centre, viz., the Oracle of Clarian Apollo. Mopsus is the expression (according to the anthropomorphic method of Greek popular thought) of the Clarian Apolline orders, in obedience to which trade and settlement on the Levant coasts set forth from the shores of Lydia and Caria.

¹ See Section III.

Mopsus was the leader and guide of the expansive energy of Mallos, as well as of Tarsus; and the town which was founded on the road from Mallos to inner and Eastern Cilicia was called Mopsou-estia, the Hearth of Mopsus. Mopsus was a far more important figure in the religion of Mallos than in that of Tarsus. He slipped out of the latter to such an extent that no other trace of his former existence is known to us there besides the village of Mopsoukrene. The reason can only be that the Greek element and the Greek religion were weaker in Tarsus than in Mallos; and that is quite certainly proved by other evidence. But the presence of Mopsus in Tarsian local nomenclature is a complete proof that the Greek element was influential at a very early time in that city.

This Greek expansion was designated in old Oriental and Semitic tradition as "the sons of Javan," i.e., the "Ionian" traders. The "sons of Javan" are the Greek race in its progress along the Levant coasts, which brought the Ionian Greeks within the sphere of knowledge and intercourse of the Semites.

The very ancient Ionian connexion of Tarsus is set forth in that important old geographical document, preserved to us in Genesis x. 4 f.: "The sons of Javan: Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim (or Rodanim, as in the Pentateuch here and the Hebrew also of 1 Chron. i. 7). Of these were the coasts of the nations divided in their lands, every one after his tongue; after their families, in their nations." The most probable interpretation of this list is still that of Josephus: Kittim is Cyprus (Kition, the leading city of early time)¹ and Tarshish is Tarsus. That Rodanim means the settlers of Rhodes seems to follow naturally (Dodanim being rejected as a false text). Elishah

¹ Another proposed identification of Kittim with the people of Ketis in Cilicia Tracheia keeps the name in the same region.

has been very plausibly explained as the land of Alasia or Alsa (mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets), which, as is generally agreed, lay somewhere in the Syrian-Cilician-Cyprian coast region; and the explanation must, in the present state of our knowledge, supersede all others (though, of course, certainty is not yet attainable on such matters).

Bearing in mind the close connexion between the Alêian plain and Mallos, and the way in which Herodotus (vi. 95) seems to assume as self-evident that Mallos was the harbour of the Alêian plain,¹ we must admit the probability of Professor Sayce's suggestion that Alasia is the Alêian plain, with its harbour and capital Mallos.² This identification would discover in the list of Gen. x. 4 the two great harbours of ancient Cilicia and the two great islands off the south coast of Asia Minor. These four were "the sons of Javan," the four Greek foundations which first brought the Ionian within the ken of the nations of Syria and Palestine.

The objections made by modern scholars to the identification of Tarsus and Tarshish, and the rival theories which they propose, seem utterly devoid of strength or probability. To suppose that Tartessos, or any other place in Spain, formed part of the list in Genesis x. 4, is geographically meaningless and historically impossible; and the theory that the Etruscan people (Tyrsenoi) was meant is nearly as bad. To say that Tarsus was not founded when this document was written is to pretend to a knowledge about the beginnings of Tarsus which we do not possess, and to set undeserved value on the foundation legends stated by Strabo and others. It is also objected that the Aramaic spelling

¹ See EXPOSITOR (Feb.), p. 275. I have to apologise for a misquotation from Pope's translation of the *Iliad* on p. 274: in the first line read "distracted" instead of "forsaken" (which crept in from the second line).

² The omission of the letter *s* between vowels is a common phenomenon in Greek.

of the name (as shown on coins of the city) was -r z- and not -r s h- ; but great changes and varieties in the spelling of foreign geographical names are frequently found in other cases ; this Cilician or Anatolian name was spelt Tarsos by the Greeks, Tarzi- in Aramaic, and Tarshish in the document of Genesis x.

It may also be urged in objection that the Greek colonies of Cilicia seem to have been Dorian, whereas Genesis x. 4 speaks of " Ionian." But who would venture, in the face of the recent discoveries which have upset all our old ideas about early Greece, to dogmatize about the meaning of " Ionian " in the second millennium B.C., or to say that " Ionians " could not have founded colonies in Cilicia so early as that ? We cannot say anything more definite than that " the sons of Javan " were the Greek settlers and traders as known to the people of Phœnicia or Syria.

It would be out of place here to discuss the questions that rise out of the various uses of the name Tarshish in the Old Testament ; nor am I competent to do so. But it is important for our present purpose to note that the exports from Tarshish to Tyre included silver, iron, tin, and lead.¹ Silver and lead are found in abundance in the Taurus mountains, close to the route of the Cilician Gates, and the mines have been worked from time immemorial. Iron has been found and worked from an extremely early time in the northern or Pontic region of Cappadocia, and it is commonly held by scholars that the use of iron for the benefit of man originated there. The Pontic production was carried south by the Cilician Gates and Tarsus. The precious stone Tarshish has not been identified.

Assuming the identification of Tarshish and Tarsus, we find the same name in various slight modifications, lasting from the second millennium before Christ, through the

¹ Ezek. xxvii. 12 ; Jer. x. 9.

Persian, Greek, Roman, Arab, Egyptian, and Turkish domination, down to the Tarsous of the present day. Tarsus, always half oriental, adapted itself readily to every Oriental ruler, and preserved its continuous individuality under all. While it would not be justifiable, in the conflict of opinion, to draw weighty historical inferences at present from the identification, we can at least infer that "the sons of Javan" are allowed by general opinion to have had a footing somewhere on the east Levant coasts in the second millennium at Alasia and Kittim. If so, they must have had landing places or ports in Cilicia, and these can hardly have been elsewhere than on the rivers at Mallos and Tarsus.

With this early origin of Tarsus we shall find that all the evidence is in perfect agreement.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE NEW COVENANT IN JEREMIAH.

THE promise of the new Covenant in Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34 has long been regarded as one of the noblest utterances of the prophecy of Israel. When we have wished to see Jeremiah most plainly, to "learn his great language, catch his clear accents," we have turned to him as he stands amid the ruins of the shattered state, a lonely, despised and persecuted man, and declares that though the old national religion is past, yet behind it there is rising a grander and fuller religion, where every loyal heart shall delight to know and do God's will, and the golden age at last be realized. And a catena of opinions from all sources, ancient and modern, might easily be made, to show how these verses have always been deemed the crown and the glory of the prophet of Anathoth, his title of entry to the company of the greatest among the goodly fellowship of the prophets.

Criticism, however, is not based upon sentiment, but on induction from ascertained facts, and accordingly a number of scholars have felt themselves obliged to deny the authorship of Jeremiah. Stade,¹ Smend,² and Schmidt³ all reject the verses. The fact that they occur in a chapter which is generally admitted to show many marks of a redactor's hand is considered fatal to their authenticity. It is reserved, however, for Duhm⁴ not only to refuse the verses to Jeremiah, but also to be unable to find in them any marks of greatness. Duhm's discussion contains a most interesting "*confessio critici*." "I have for a long time," he writes, "tried to understand the passage in accordance with the

¹ *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel.*

² *Lehrbuch d. A.T. Religionsgeschichte.*

³ *Enc. Bib.* s.v., "Covenant" and "Jeremiah."

⁴ *K. Hand-Commentar.*

undoubtedly genuine sections from Jeremiah's hand. . . . The sentence is certainly beautiful, and has induced many (me also) to seek something deep in it." But apparently the well is found very shallow, and what water it contains only stale. "The author," says Duhm, "is quite ignorant of Protestant Dogmatics and Old Testament Theology." And the conclusion is that he is to be regarded as a scribe, with the narrow outlook of later Judaism, who can picture a race of Pharisees, but nothing beyond that.

The grounds of this verdict may be classified as follows : (1) The contents, meaning, and manner of institution of the new Covenant ; (2) Its consequences upon the life of the people ; (3) The historical standpoint and linguistic character of the passage. In examining these reasons constant reference will be made to Cornill's criticism of them. His new Commentary on Jeremiah,¹ a work which he presents as the realized dream of his early manhood, is an exposition worthy of the great reputation of the author, and a mine of wealth for all students of the Old Testament.

1. First then as to the meaning of the new Covenant. It is necessary to begin by ascertaining precisely what is meant by the old and broken Covenant. To Duhm this is the completed system of legislation, particularly the priestly laws. He states that in contents there is no difference between the new and the old, and speaks of "statutes, commandments, precepts, laws about food, regulations about holiness," which are henceforth to be written on the heart. This is doubtless the traditional explanation, and the one that lies at the back of Hebrews viii., but it is questionable whether it can be accepted in the face of a critical study of the sources.

What do the sources yield us as to the use of the word "Covenant" ? Cornill calls attention to the fact that this

¹ *Das Buch Jeremia* (Leipzig, 1905).

term is never used in P to describe the transactions at Sinai. The great Covenant in P is always the Abrahamic one. "Therefore an author who places at Sinai the fundamental covenanting between Jahweh and Israel is at least not dependent on P." That is a reasonable conclusion. It can, however, be made much more convincing, if we observe two facts about the way in which the priestly writers speak of the Covenant, which are not mentioned either by Cornill or Duhm.

(a) In the first place, it should be carefully noted that to these writers a Divine Covenant is everlasting. Such was the Covenant made with the whole human race after the Flood, of which the rainbow was the perpetual sign¹; and such was the Covenant made with the Jewish race in the person of Abraham, of which circumcision was the token and seal.² Each of these Covenants is expressly called everlasting. Accordingly the partiarchal Covenant is thought of as lasting right through the exile and as being the cause of the ultimate restoration of the people. A passage from Leviticus xxvi. 44-45 makes that quite plain. "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them; for I am Jahweh their God: but I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations." A reference to the earlier verses shows that is the same Covenant made long before with Abraham, renewed to Isaac and Jacob, renewed afresh at each stage of the national history, never to be abrogated. Seeing then that this is what the priestly writers understand by a Covenant, a divine promise as enduring as its Author, a *διαθήκη* not a *συνθήκη*, an

¹ Gen. ix. 9-17.

² Gen. xvii. 7.

appointment and not a compact, no man imbued with their ideas would have been likely to think of a new Covenant as the first essential for a restored Israel.

(β) But, secondly, the language used by the different sources makes this result almost certain. There are three words used for "making" a covenant—to cut, to set, to establish, (כרת, נתן, הקים). The first of these is used in this passage. What is the usage of the documents of the Pentateuch? This is best shown in tabular form:—

	JE	D	P
Cut (כרת)	8	13 ¹	0
Set (נתן)	0	0	2
Establish (הקים)	0	1	9

It is surely plain that wherever the author found his definition of the old Covenant it was not in P.

2. If then we reject Duhm's view so decisively, where are we to seek for the old Covenant? Many would reply with Kautzsch, "The prophet is thinking in all probability of the law book introduced by Josiah in the year 621."² So Schmidt, whilst rejecting Jeremiah's authorship of this passage, says, "Jeremiah used berith only to designate Josiah's law, which he regarded as having been given through Moses at the time when Jahweh brought Israel out of Egypt."³

But closer investigation does not support this view. The book of Deuteronomy speaks of three Covenants—that made with the fathers,⁴ that made at Horeb based on the Decalogue,⁵ and that drawn up in the plains of Moab, expressly distinguished from the Horeb Covenant,⁶ and

¹ For this list Deut. xxxi. 16 is counted as D.

² *D. B.* vol. v. 697a.

³ *Enc. Bib.* col. 933.

⁴ Deut. iv. 31, vii. 12, etc.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. 13, v. 2 ff., ix. 9 ff., etc.

⁶ Deut. xxix. 1 and the whole chapter.

actually containing Deuteronomy xii.-xxvi., xxviii. One verse makes this last distinction plain. "These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make¹ with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made¹ with them in Horeb."²

Now as to the third of these, it would hardly be described as a Covenant made "in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt."³ To what time does this refer? Jeremiah himself, in one of his best known utterances, supplies the most probable answer. He says, "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people."⁴ Here it seems most likely that he is distinguishing between the code of Deuteronomy, with its insistence on the central sanctuary and on sacrificial dues, and some earlier and simpler law of obedience. The Deuteronomic code is said to have been published a full generation after the departure from Egypt. Hence without attempting to give any unduly literal meaning to the word "day," we may at least claim that this note of time would be, in our passage also, singularly inappropriate as applied to Josiah's law book.

Rejecting then this view also, we find ourselves driven back in our search for the old Covenant to the two descriptions of the transactions at Sinai contained in Exodus xx.-xxiii. and in the early chapters of Deuteronomy. Studying these

¹ ברית.

² Deut xxix. 1, properly the close of chapter xxviii.; so the Hebrew.

³ Jer. xxxi. 32.

⁴ Jer. vii. 22, 23.

we are at once arrested by the statement in Deuteronomy iv. 13: "And He declared unto you His Covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and He wrote them upon two tables of stones."¹ These tables are called the tables of the Covenant.² Here then is a Covenant satisfying the tests both of time and of language, for the verb "cut" (כרת) is used consistently to describe the institution. If this argument is admitted, we have reached the conclusion that to the Deuteronomists "Covenant" became almost a technical term to describe the Decalogue, or the two tables of stone on which the Decalogue in its primitive form was written. This explains the term—only used by Deuteronomic writers—"the ark of the Covenant." It means simply the ark that contained the Covenant. So 1 Kings viii. 21, "the ark, wherein is the Covenant of the Lord," becomes plain without need of emendation. And 1 Kings viii. 9, can now be translated quite simply when it is recognized that "the two tables of stone" and "Covenant" can be used interchangeably. "There was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone (or Covenant), which Moses put there at Horeb, which the Lord made with the children of Israel."³ Further, our discussion explains why in P the ark is always called "the ark of the testimony" (ערת), never of the Covenant. As has been shown above, the term Covenant had been taken right back to the time of Abraham, and was no longer applicable in the sense of D. But that in P the term "Testimony" is used to replace "Covenant" in the earlier sources, a reference to Exodus xxv. 16 and 21, "thou shalt put in the ark the Testimony which I shall give thee," seems to make quite clear.

¹ Cp. also chap. v. 2, 3.

² Chap. ix. 9, etc.

³ The LXX. distinctly favours this, ἡ διέθετο Κύριος μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν, etc.

As the result then of this discussion, arrived at without presuppositions, but from a study of linguistic use, we claim that we have shown that by the old Covenant the author of Jeremiah xxxi. 31 ff. means the Decalogue and nothing else. If this is so, we have found a strong positive ground for the early date of the verses. A writer at the close of the Persian period (so Schmidt) would never have based his charges against the people on breaches of the Decalogue. That would have been as foreign to his mode of thinking as to that of a Pharisee in the days of our Lord. On the other hand, such an attitude is, as Cornill points out, entirely in harmony with Jeremiah's position. Theft, murder, adultery, false swearing, covetousness, idolatry, these are the dark blots on the people's life which fill his soul with horror, which no washing with soap or lye can purge away.¹

3. If then we decide that under the new Covenant the law of the Ten Words is to be written on the hearts of the faithful, is the conclusion as lame and impotent as Duhm suggests? He says, "Though the author calls this a new Covenant, yet really it is only a renewed one, and the only difference consists in this, that in the future Jahweh will show greater care that the Israelites may remain true to it. We find here nothing of what appears to us to be necessary for a new Covenant, nothing of a regenerate spiritual man, nothing of a loftier revelation of God." Of course, if the Covenant referred principally to ritual observances, something might be said along these lines. But is it true of the Decalogue? Cornill reminds us that "Jesus did not set aside the demands of the Decalogue; He only deepened and enriched their content." That comment leads us at once to the right point of view. In Jesus we see, for the first time, One on whose heart the divine law

¹ Jer. vii. 5-9, v. 7, 8, vi. 13 et passim.

was truly written. As He reveals to us the depths of meaning hidden in those ancient words, and sounds our hearts with His searching tests, we learn that we must indeed be regenerate and spiritual men before our hearts can be inclined to keep those laws.

But Duhm objects further that the author, warm and pious adherent of the Law as he is, is quite unable to say how the future he desires is to be brought in, how men are to be made fit for it ; or why, if Jahweh Himself is the sole Agent, He did not do this work long ago. He sees in all this "the mark of a pious disposition, but no work of a creative spirit, of a prophet who really has something new to say."

The answer to this must now be manifest. "When," says Cornill, "in his characterization of the new Covenant, by contrast with the old, he says that Jahweh Himself will write the precepts of this Covenant in the heart, his saying only acquires its full depth and significance if Jahweh Himself also wrote the precepts of the old Covenant." Again we recognize that we are at the true point of view. It is only when we remember how the Ten Words were written by the finger of God Himself on the two tables of stone that we catch the author's meaning fully. The same Divine Hand writes the law in each case, now however no longer on cold and lifeless stone, but on the warm and fleshly tables of the heart. With what fine spiritual insight has St. Paul seen the true scope of this promise in 2 Corinthians iii. ! And who can say that there is here no mark of the true creative genius, no touch of real poetry ?

Returning again to Duhm's objection that we have no indication of the way in which the human heart is to be so changed that it will be fit to receive the inward law, we have the right to reply that the difficulty is of his own making. For those who are able to hold to the authorship

of Jeremiah there is no difficulty at all. Jeremiah's earlier teaching as to the need of true repentance and the circumcision of the heart shows that he at least was not ignorant of the rise and progress of religion in the soul, and could never regard conversion as a mere process from without. It is only when the passage is treated as an isolated fragment from an unknown author that Duhm's perplexity is felt. And even then it is hardly fair to judge the pseudo-Jeremiah by the absence of what he has not the chance of saying.

When, finally, Duhm asks, and asks with such earnestness that the sincerity of the question is patent, "Why did not Jahweh do this at first? Is He not Himself to blame for the fact that the Covenant fell?", we find again Cornill's answer the obvious and the only satisfying one. He refers us to all the insoluble questions that may be asked, "Why, since Christianity is the highest form of God's revelation to mankind, did He not send Jesus at the Creation? And why did He not take care that the truth He brings should be plain to all the world?" The only answer is, that the God who makes history reveals Himself in history. "Even so Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight."

4. Turning next to the effects of the new Covenant upon the lives of the people, we are met again by Duhm's explanation, that it is intended to make of them all scribes learned in the law. "Our author never thinks of the future after the manner of Joel iii. 1 ff., it is enough for him when the position is reached towards which the scribes are already striving, the complete consecration of every burgher to the doctrine of the law." Hence the forgiveness of sins spoken of in *v.* 34 is really not a spiritual blessing, it is the promise of the time when all past wrongdoing has been atoned for, when conscious of integrity the Jewish nation will enjoy to its heart's desire earthly prosperity, power and honour. This exposition obviously turns upon the meaning

of the phrase, "all shall know Me." We ask therefore what the knowledge of God means in the Old Testament generally, and in particular whether it ever means knowledge of ritual requirements? When Hosea says, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offering,"¹ or declares that the "people are destroyed for lack of knowledge,"² is it not plain that to him the knowledge of God must be expressed in morality, just as ignorance of God results in the wrongs which he denounces? Isaiah xi. 1-9 gives further instruction on the same point, "The spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jahweh are one, such knowledge must bring impartiality, justice, and peace. In 1 Samuel ii. 12 it is said, even of the priests at the altar, that "they know not Jahweh" and, as examination of the passage shows, their ignorance was clearly revealed by their immorality and greed. And if we are content to turn to Jeremiah himself for guidance, we find it everywhere. "They that handle the law," he says, "know Me not,"³ proof surely that knowing the details of ritual and knowing God were far asunder in his mind. The ninth chapter is specially instructive: "Through deceit they refuse to know Me, saith Jahweh." The truth is that the prophets of Israel knew well the principle that we express in philosophical language, when we say that "moral affinity is needful for the knowledge of a person."⁴ They did not teach with Socrates that knowledge and virtue are one; they were certain that without knowledge no virtue was possible. Hence, again, by purely exegetical methods we find in this passage no dream of a mere Pharisee, no longing after the earthly glory of a purely Jewish state, but the

¹ Hos. vi. 3.

² Hos. iv. 1-6.

³ Jer. ii. 8.

⁴ Vide Illingworth, *Sampton Lectures*, v.

craving for the day when the pure in heart will see God, and in doing His will learn for the first time to truly understand His nature. That is why forgiveness of sins is promised so plainly ; without it no reconciliation can ever come.

5. Summing up, we are able to claim that every conception of the passage becomes transparent and easy if we attribute it to Jeremiah ; all the difficulties arise if it is of late date and unknown authorship. Its brevity is easily understood if it is really the final flower of the great prophet's teaching. We need not be for ever laying again the foundations of our doctrine for those who know us well. Yet, after all, if there are to be found, either in the general outlook of the passage or in its language, unmistakable signs of late origin, all these previous considerations will be worthless. We therefore turn, in the last place, to consider the internal evidence of date.

The last clause of *v.* 32 is certainly strange. The R.V. (so Driver) translates, "Although I was an husband to them"; cf. chap. iii. 14. The introduction of the marriage idea seems to disturb the thought¹; moreover, the phrase looks much more like a parallel or antithetic phrase to "They brake my Covenant." Accordingly Giesebrecht, Duhm and Cornill unitedly accept an old emendation of Capell's,² and read בעלתי,³ "became weary of" or "rejected with loathing," instead of בעלתי, "was an husband." The passage now reads, "For, *they* brake my Covenant, and *I* spurned them away." On this Duhm comments: "If this is right, Jeremiah cannot have written the verse, for no unprejudiced reader will understand by the casting

¹ Cp. however, Jer. ii. 2, a close parallel.

² Vide Ges., *Thesaurus*, s.v. בעל.

³ For בעל cp. Jer. xiv. 19 and Ezek. xvi. 45. The LXX. read ἡμέλησα: vid. *Thesaurus*.

away anything else but the exile ; and the man who says, "The fathers were sent by Jahweh into exile because of covenant-breaking," must be living very much later. Cornill thinks that Jeremiah may have written so any time after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, which is certainly true. But was not Jeremiah just the one man who could have written such words sooner ? If we ask, "When did Jeremiah consider that the breaking of the old Covenant was completed ?", we find at once that the answer is, "At the captivity of Jeconiah in 597." So soon as that disaster was past, Jeremiah centred his hopes for the future upon the exiles in Babylonia ; the letter to Babylon bidding them settle there as good citizens (chap. xxix.), and the discourse about the good and worthless figs (chap. xxiv.), seem conclusive proofs of this. It was with the children of the exiles, seventy years later, that the new Covenant would be fully made. If so, any date between 597-586 will suit the passage. Further, the reference to "the house of Judah" (v. 31) is now explained. Duhm thinks this a sign of late date because Jeremiah himself is accustomed to describe the whole people as the house of Israel.¹ Cornill rejects the reference to Judah on metrical grounds. But if Jeremiah is speaking under the overwhelming pressure of the thought that the southern kingdom has sealed her own fate, and followed her sinful sister into exile, what more natural than that he should name them both ? He would not desert the city—truest patriot of them all, he stayed at his post though he was certain all hope was gone—but he could look out to Israel and Judah scattered among the nations and trust that God would bring both back again.

Linguistic details may be dealt with briefly. V. 32 : אִשֶּׁר = יַעַן אִשֶּׁר = *inasmuch as* or *because*, is not necessarily late (cf. Gen. xxx. 18, E, other exx. in Ges.-K 158b).

¹ Cp. iii. 20, v. 15, ix. 25, etc.

Or Oxf. Heb. Lex., s.v., 82*a*, translates, "I, whose covenant they brake" (cf. Exod. xiv. 13, J). V. 34: "Small and great" is, according to Duhm, "a favourite expression of the later writers"; for this, however, cp. 1 Sam. v. 9 and esp. Jer. vi. 13. V. 34: יָנִס, instead of the suffix, is late (Duhm); but cf. Jer. iii. 14, xxiii. 33, etc., or Gen. iv. 14, 15, etc.

Distinct characteristics of Jeremiah's style are not wanting. Thus, "Behold the days come," occurs fifteen times in this book, elsewhere only in Amos (thrice), and twice besides (so Driver, *IOT*).

"The day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt" is highly characteristic. See above, and compare vii. 22, 25, xi. 4, 7.

While Duhm considers the style of the whole passage "bad, trailing (*schleppende*), inexact," Cornill thinks it "rhythmically elevated and articulated discourse," well suited to its content, and easily explained by the soul-shaking events of the time of its origin. To us Cornill's appears the sounder estimate. We conclude then that we may still read in these verses the message of Jeremiah himself. Faith never took a bolder flight than this. And whenever Jeremiah comes to his own, and is accorded his rightful place as one of the noblest and purest spirits of all history, these great words will be recognized as the imperishable crown of all his strenuous life.

WILFRID J. MOULTON.

“ FROM THE TREE.”

IN his suggestive paper, “The Lord Reigned from the Tree,” J. H. A. Hart points out (EXPOSITOR, Nov. 1905, p. 329), that, apart from its citation by Justin and Tertullian, the phrase “from the tree” actually occurs in Psalm xciv. (xcvi.) in one document, which is at least not nominally Christian—a cursive Psalter: there, however, it is read, ἀπὸ τῶ ξύλω. Mr. Hart explains this reading in the following way:

Of all transcriptional variants in Greek MSS. that of ἀπό for ἐπί is among the commonest. The dative, of course, calls for ἐπί and not ἀπό, and no one who has handled many cursive manuscripts would hesitate to accede to its just demand. The reward of this concession is immediate and ample. ἐπί τῷ ξύλω will be in Hebrew γַע לַי. . . . The variation . . . ἀπό for ἐπί may be a Christian emendation or a pure accident, etc.

That is all very ingenious; but why not stick to the explanation, which seemed to me always a matter of course, that ἀπὸ τῶ ξύλω is simply a translation from the Latin “a ligno,” preserving in Greek the ablative case of the Latin? The Greek MS. 156, which alone has preserved this reading, betrays also at other places Latin influence. It has an *interlinear Latin* version. It is again unique, as far as we know at present, in preserving the Latin “*quinta sabbati*” as πεμπτη σαββατου in the heading of Ps. lxxx. (lxxxii.). See on ἀπὸ τῶ ξύλω Swete’s *Introduction* (second edition, p. 160 note), pp. 424, 467. If codex U of the Psalms were complete, probably we should read there, “ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου”; see F. E. Brightman, “The Sahidic Text of the Psalter,” (*Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. p. 278), as we read ἀπὸ ξύλου in R (the Greek and Latin Codex Veronensis); for it is found in the Sahidic Version too. The most interesting example of the influence of one language on the other in

the section of prepositions which I have at hand at this moment, is *σίνε πάτρις οἴου ἄνευ πατρός* (Plutarch, *Quæst. Roman.* 103).

I fear the explanation of Mr. Hart, ingenious as it is, will not stand proof.

EB. NESTLE.

*THE SPIRITUAL MEANING OF THE LIFE OF
CHRIST.*

The Gospel in the Gospels, by W. P. Du Bose, S.T.D., Professor of Exegesis in the University of the South (U.S.A.). Longmans, 1906.—From time to time *alumni* of the University of the South find their way to Oxford. And I have noticed about them, that they speak with even more than the usual veneration of their University and of its home at Sewanee in the State of Tennessee—planted on a high plateau more than 2,000 feet above the sea and breaking downwards in picturesque ravines and gullies. The University has no millionaire behind it, like so many of the great institutions of the Western Republic. To all appearance ruined soon after its foundation by the Civil War, and a gradual growth from small beginnings, it yields to none of its wealthier and more imposing competitors in the affectionate reverence of its sons. Indeed there has always seemed to me to be a peculiar quality about this reverence, such as we, on this side the Atlantic, are accustomed to see in those poorer bodies that have about them some special touch of romance.

Sewanee to its votaries is a kind of Mecca, and it has its prophet—a living prophet—in Dr. W. P. Du Bose, the Dean of its Theological Faculty, who is a real sage and seer.

I had the privilege of meeting Dr. Du Bose—not for the first time, for we had made acquaintance some ten or eleven years before in Oxford—under the hospitable roof of the Editor of *The Churchman*. We had several strolls together

along the lovely shores of Long Island ; and I found in him a seer of the cultivated, quiet, homely kind, not without the charms of that self-forgetfulness which is permitted to thinkers, and with absolute singleness of aim. Dr. Du Bose, as might be inferred from his name, is of French extraction. He told me that in a long line of ancestry there was only one British name—that of a Scottish Sinclair. And yet in spite of this descent, he said, “ I’m English all over.” Needless to add, we struck an alliance on the spot. Dr. Du Bose’s ancestry had been loyalists in the War of Independence. He himself, as a young man, had fought in the ranks of the Confederates, had been badly wounded and taken prisoner, and reported dead, and had then taken an active and devoted part both in the literal and the moral rebuilding of Sewanee.

I.

There were all the materials here for casting a horoscope ; and in addition, I had—and ought to have had still more—the advantage afforded by earlier works, *The Soteriology of the New Testament* (1892), and *The Ecumenical Councils*, (2nd edition 1897) ; and yet I do not think that I quite expected all that I find in this new book, *The Gospel in the Gospels*.

I will say what is in my mind at once : it is just the kind of book that English-speaking Christianity is wanting ! The world is always in want of a prophet—we at this moment are specially in want of a prophet—and here is one !

Let me try to describe what the character of the book is.

In the first place, as to style and manner. Curiously enough, as I think over the book, there rise irresistibly to my mind two passages of Wordsworth that may well seem far remote from its subject. One is from the “ Poet’s Epitaph.”

But who is this, with modest looks
And clad in homely russet brown? . . .

Not that I would suggest any defect of clerical costume ; there was no such defect. And if the author is a poet, he is so most unconsciously. There are certainly none of the airs and graces of a poet. That is really the esoteric meaning of the "russet brown." The book shows a quite perceptible neglect—I had almost said impatience, if Dr. Du Bose could ever be impatient—of the ordinary little literary conventions. There is hardly a reference all through the book. There are no inverted commas for quotations. Every now and then a sentence reads rather awkwardly ; sometimes it will not construe at all. Dr. Du Bose shares with some of his countrymen a certain readiness in coining new words, about which we on this side the Atlantic should have some scruple : "reportorial" (pp. 8, 131), "immanental" (p. 47), "righteousing" (in the sense of "making righteous" or "investing with the character of righteousness," p. 123).

But we feel, as we read, that these are the merest trivialities, which come quite as much from the total absence of literary vanity as from anything else. Really, the style and matter fit each other admirably. Dr. Du Bose is dealing with lofty, and by no means easy and obvious themes ; he is obliged to repeat the same abstract thought many times throughout his book ; and yet he never seems in want of an apt and aptly varied expression. There is no real obscurity ; if any reader finds any part of the book obscure, the fault is probably in himself ; perhaps it is too much to expect that all the world should breathe freely at such altitudes. To clothe in grave and suitable words so much deep thinking is no small achievement. The book bears a stamp of its own, it is one that no one else could have written.

The other Wordsworthian echo that comes to me arises out of the subject matter and mode of treatment.

When with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
We see into the life of things.

The one slight change that has to be made here is that we must substitute some more sober word for "joy." Not that it was possible to write such a book without an inward emotion closely akin to joy. If a note of elation had broken through now and then, no one would have been surprised. It is sheer simplicity, sincerity and self-restraint. We are reminded of Lamb.

Her parents held the Quaker rule,
Which doth the human feeling cool.

Dr. Du Bose is not at all a Quaker, but he has something of the admirable calm which we associate with that body. The colour of his book is grey, though we might well expect the imagination that is at work in it to make its glow felt and seen through the pages. That it should do this so little is a mark of strength—of the same quiet unconscious strength that is the dominant quality throughout. I hope, if all's well, before I have done, to give an example of the highest point of dithyrambic eloquence to which the book attains. Even that I think will be pronounced sober enough.

To sum up this descriptive part of my notice. It is a strong, grave, penetrating book, that would be austere if the thought were not too rich and deep and elevating for austerity.

But I must not forget that I have not even yet explained the purpose of the book and the place that it holds in literature. It is not a Life of Christ, and yet we shall perhaps understand its object best if we compare it with Lives of Christ. We have had these of various kinds : we have had picturesque Lives, and we have had learned Lives. *The*

Gospel in the Gospels does not aim at being either. It is indeed potentially more learned than it may seem. One whose own work is concerned with the same subject can read between the lines ; he can see more knowledge of the modern treatment of it than is allowed to appear. Dr. Du Bose is in truth entirely modern. But the distaste for details of which we have spoken limits the influence of this to results ; it does not let us see the process that leads to the results.

Dr. Du Bose calls his book *The Gospel in the Gospels*. It is not a complete picture of the Life of Christ. It is not an attempt to place that picture in its historical setting. In other words, it is not an attempt to reproduce and modernize the substance of the Gospels, so far as that substance is capable of being presented as it were visibly to the eye of the mind. But it is rather a sustained endeavour to get at the inner spiritual meaning that lies behind all such external presentation. It is a high and serious effort to determine the principles at work in the Life of Christ, to express them in the most compact and abstract form, and to view them in their inner coherence and mutual relations. We might call this a *philosophy* of the Life of Christ : it belongs throughout to the region of philosophy, or philosophical theology, as opposed to that of history or criticism.

It might be expected that there would be some difficulty in delimiting the two spheres, some confusion of their natural boundaries. As a rule this has been avoided very successfully ; the book is a complete and rounded whole, with its outline well defined. There is only just one single case that I am inclined to think of as an exception. The Temptation of our Lord seems to me best treated historically, in relation to the recasting of the Messianic idea. I cannot help thinking it rather artificial to bring the three temptations under the heads respectively of Faith, Hope and Love. I cannot

remember anything else in the book to which I could give such an epithet ; but it seems to me in this instance due to the cause I have mentioned, the attempt to bring under philosophical or theological categories a problem that is primarily historical.

II.

The book, as I have already said, is planned in three main divisions : considering, (1) the Earthly Life of our Lord ; (2) His Work ; (3) His Person. This three-fold division is the carrying out of a very interesting principle laid down in the Preface. Dr. Bu Bose is very sympathetic towards modern thought ; he feels that, in view of the present position, a different attitude is advisable from that which was characteristic of early Christianity. The early Christians held that truth is a whole, and that anything that came short of full truth was by that very fact condemned and excluded. Dr. Du Bose, on the other hand, holds that even partial truth is true as far as it goes—" that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is so true and so living in every part that he who truly possesses and truly uses any broken fragment of it may find in that fragment something—just so much—of gospel for his soul and of salvation for his life." In pursuance of this principle the argument works its way upwards : first, through the lower stage of the earthly life of Christ, His common humanity with ours, considered as such ; then, through the contemplation of His Work, as centring in the Resurrection ; and so lastly to " the gospel of the Person or the Incarnation."

I am not quite sure that this scheme is altogether a success. I am much inclined to go with the principle from which it starts ; and the first part seems to me really to form a rounded whole. But I am not so clear that a dividing line can be drawn, in the same sense, between the second

and the third. I doubt if we can frame an adequate appreciation of the Work of Christ apart from presuppositions derived from our estimate of His Person. I may even go further than this, and raise the question whether it is possible to attach any special value, such as Christians attach, to the Work of Christ without bringing in the higher Christian conception of His Person.

I have therefore a little wondered how far the leading idea of the Preface may have been an after-thought. But, however that may be, the real evolution of the book is less materially affected than we might perhaps at the first blush have supposed that it would be. There is indeed, as I have implied, a certain amount of inevitable anticipation of the later stages in the earlier; but this is not at all excessive, and the natural upwards progression of the thought is not much disturbed.

Part I., which stands by itself more distinctly than the other two, deals in succession with, The Impression of the Earthly Life of Jesus (chap. i.); The Growth and Preparation of Jesus (ii.); The Divine Sonship of Humanity (iii.); The Son of Man (iv.); The Kingdom of God (v.); The Authority of Jesus (vi.); The Blessedness of Jesus (vii.); The Beatitudes (viii., ix.); The Death of Jesus (x.).

As I do not propose to return to this division of the book, I will give a single specimen to show what it is like. The passage is interesting, because it rather markedly—but I suspect quite independently—coincides with much that is being said in quarters very far distant from Sewanee. There is a tendency “in the air” at the present time to qualify the old conception of meekness.

Men, according to Aristotle, in the spirit and temper of their dealings with one another, should be controlled by a disposition which he calls meekness or mildness or gentleness. The term is the best we have, he says, but it is inadequate, it is not positive or strong enough. Moses stands out as the type of the Hebrew righteousness;

he might be said to have been the creator of it. And we speak of the meekness of Moses as though that were his distinguishing trait. But surely we have all felt the inadequacy of the term meekness to express the character or disposition of Moses. Our Lord seems to have selected the same term to express His own fundamental disposition. Take my yoke upon you, He says, and learn of me. For I am meek and lowly in heart ; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. And yet we too feel that the word meek is scarcely the one to describe Jesus. We feel even that too much application of that term to Him has weakened the popular conception not only of Himself but of Christianity. It has contributed perhaps to the too negative and colorless interpretation of His great principle of non-resistance. . . . In the co-called meekness of Moses there is a lofty unselfishness, a great humility, a perfection of zeal and devotion, which momentary weakness and impatiences scarcely detract from. The Law and the Prophets between them were productive of great types. But the perfection of human spirit and temper waited still for its realization and manifestation. When Jesus speaks of the meek, He speaks of Himself. He speaks of that attitude towards men under all possible conditions of provocation and trial which He had deliberately made His own and which never deserted Him under any temptation to the contrary. . . . I do not know how we can define or describe in abstract terms the peculiar meekness, or what is attempted to be expressed by the meekness of Jesus. *The thing is ever more and greater, and even different, from its best expression.* That is why God never gives us definitions or descriptions of things, but always manifestations of the thing itself. . . . But the interesting point about the beatitude is this : the perfect assurance of Jesus that the right, the true attitude of man toward man will be the ultimately successful and surviving attitude. The meek shall inherit and possess the earth. The spirit and temper and disposition of Jesus, because it is the fittest, because it is that which alone gives true meaning and value to life, because it is the only bond of perfect relationship and intercourse among men, will survive and prevail. (pp. 99-103.)

It would be too bad to call attention by italics to one of the few sentences here and there that do not construe ("greater . . . from"), but I do so really for another purpose, as an instance of the wise incidental sayings that are scattered far more freely over Dr. Du Bose's pages. We shall come across others in the sequel.

The passage as a whole may be taken as a good average

sample of the freshness and originality with which Dr. Du Bose writes. But we go to him especially as a philosophic theologian on a large scale ; and it is to this aspect of his book that I shall confine myself henceforward.

III.

It is just a full *lustrum* since it fell to me in THE EXPOSITOR for May 1901 to review my dear friend Dr. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. I was led to say of it that it was long since I had seen a book that gave one so much the impression of having been really *thought out*. It was neither more nor less than a system of theology complete in itself. I should now say just the same thing of *The Gospel in the Gospels*. And—what is still more remarkable—not only is this too a real system, completely articulated in itself, but it is practically the very same system. Rarely can it happen that two writers, at a distance of some five thousand miles from each other and brought up in circumstances entirely different, each following the train of his own thought and without any direct communication, should arrive at results so nearly identical. I know that Dr. Moberly had read an earlier book by Dr. Du Bose ; and I believe—though I am not sure—that Dr. Du Bose is acquainted with the writings of Dr. Moberly. But I am convinced that in neither case does this fact, so far as it is a fact, at all impair the originality of the development. Both are eminently logical writers ; and their logic—the logic of no sudden impulse but of a lifetime—has led them from the same premises, by the same method, to the same conclusions.

This is very conspicuous over the whole of the ground covered by Dr. Moberly's volume, which (as I have said) was remarkably comprehensive. The whole theory of

Personality, and the whole theory of Atonement in the two books coincide.

Dr. Moberly, it will be remembered, put forward a view of Personality that seemed to many paradoxical. He held that true freedom of the will consisted, not in the licence of doing simply what one pleased, but in the gradual conforming of the human will to the Divine. He held also that the perfecting of the Self is not to be had in distinctness or isolation, but by the permeating and penetration of the human spirit by the Spirit of God. Both these fundamental thoughts appear repeatedly in Dr. Du Bose.

The American scholar insists quite as strongly as the English that the real atonement or reconciling of man to God can only be completely brought about by this action of the Holy Ghost. As Dr. Du Bose puts it :

It is not the Gospel nor the kingdom of God nor salvation to men that they shall be made the *objects only* of all the mercy and the goodness of the universe. Nothing can be done merely to us or for us that will save us. To be loved, to be sympathized with and helped, to be shown mercy and forgiven, to be the objects of the most unconditional divine grace, are a very great deal. But these are the merest circumstances of human salvation, they are not salvation itself. No one saw more clearly than our Lord that life and blessedness is not in what is done to us, but only in what we ourselves are and do. . . . Therefore, Jesus quickly and decisively passes from the consideration of men as the mere recipients or objects of the goodness of God, of which He was the almoner, to the highest thought of them as the subjects of the divine goodness, as partakers and sharers of the divine spirit and nature and life of love and goodness. (p. 66.)

Not less uncompromising is the following :

All the reality in the universe can be no Gospel to us so long as it remains objective, or until it enters into living relation with ourselves. Of course, it can never so enter unless there is in us the natural potentiality of entering into relation with it. But equally certainly that potentiality can only be actualized by ourselves. What is necessary within ourselves to give effect to all that is true without us is a corresponding response, or a response of correspondence, on our part. That correspondence is, I repeat,

not a fact of natural relationship, but an act of spiritual communication or self-impartment. When the Spirit bears witness with our spirit, that we are sons of God, it is not only God who communicates the gracious fact, but it is God who awakens the humble and grateful response, and puts it into our heart to say, Abba, Father. . . . It is through this eternal Spirit, which is God's and Christ's and ours, that we pass from ourselves into Christ and through Christ into God. (p. 286 f.)

It will be seen that the whole conception of Atonement or reconciliation is worked out essentially on the lines of Romans vi. The death of Christ upon the Cross was a death to sin, and to all that gave sin its hold upon humanity. But this death to sin had in it an inclusive virtue; it is an act in which every Christian is called upon and is enabled to share. The medium of this enabling is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, through which the believer is made one with Christ, so that he both dies with Him and also rises again with Him to newness of life.

All this is strictly based upon the teaching of St. Paul. But it is a satisfaction to see that the interpretation of that teaching is not so one-sided as it often is. There are some writers who, in laying stress upon Romans vi., seem to think that they can afford to neglect or forget Romans iii. Dr. Du Bose does not do this. He is careful to balance one side of his teaching with the other.

Remission, or the putting away, of sin, includes two ideas, or perhaps more correctly two stages of the same idea. It means a real putting away by the New Testament process of sanctification. But it also means the provisional putting away by the equally New Testament act of divine pardon or forgiveness. Each of these two conceptions plays an important part in the drama of redemption or final deliverance and freedom from sin. And the complete meaning of each and perfect relating of both is no small part of New Testament doctrine. (p. 132.)

This other half of the process is elsewhere explained quite clearly and satisfactorily :

Here comes in the other sense of remission, not as yet the complete impartation, but already the perfect imputation to us of the whole holiness, righteousness, and life of God as realized for us in Jesus Christ. The moment a human life has really made Jesus Christ its *end*, although that end be as yet only the end of purpose, and infinitely not yet the end of attainment, that moment God imputes to that life what it means and intends as though it had already accomplished it. St. Paul perfectly caught the principle, and perfectly expressed it in the doctrine which is the root of his system : Faith is imputed to us for righteousness ; it is reckoned or accounted as being righteousness. (p. 153.)

It is the difference between the ideal and the actual, the beginning of a Christian's career and the end. That St. Paul should insist so strongly on this initial imperfect and anticipatory stage is due to the fact that we are most of us so much nearer to this stage than we are to the other. For us the process of dying to sin by repentance, of throwing ourselves into the work of Christ by faith, the struggle to keep ourselves from falling back, must needs take precedence of that perfecting of holiness, which will never be complete on this side the grave. In practice we are obliged to start from the actual, and to look at things as they are ; but it is a great help to us in theory to look at the process as a whole, to see it not in the light of our weak and uncertain efforts, but as it is consummated through Christ in God.

IV.

The reader who is familiar with Dr. Moberly's great work will be constantly reminded of it in all that is said by Dr. Du Bose on the double subject of "Atonement and Personality." The fundamental lines of thought are the same ; and they are laid down with equal firmness and lucidity. But the resemblance between the two books is very far from ending here. I have spoken of both as containing what is really little short of a complete system of theology ; and

they might be described as almost doubles, one of the other, over the whole field. It would be really an excellent exercise to read the two books side by side ; they will be constantly found to illustrate and supplement each other. Sometimes Dr. Du Bose states his thought with unusual boldness of concrete expression : but the logic of both writers is equally rigorous and essentially the same ; and it is sometimes helpful to look for the premises in the one of the conclusions that are found in the other.

I will presently try to illustrate this. But the last division of Dr. Du Bose's book is so broad and so strong, and I may add so valuable, as a survey of the root ideas of Christian theology that I shall take advantage of it to give examples of the treatment of some difficult questions where its help seems to me specially welcome.

I will take first what is said about the mystery of our Lord's Birth. The extract will be rather long, but I only wish that it could be longer still ; I cannot find in my heart to abridge it further.

While the order of things in themselves is always forward, the order of thought about things is backward, so that our last knowledge is that of adequate or sufficient causes. So Christianity may have rested for a moment upon the spiritual endowment of Jesus, as covered by His baptism or anointing with the Holy Ghost from heaven. But not for long ; the explanation was inadequate ; it was impossible to see in Jesus only a man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs. The deeper question of His person could not but follow after the others and gradually work its way to the front. . . . It says nothing about the Gospel of the infancy as a direct naive record of facts, to recognize a more or less conscious or unconscious reason or motive for its introduction. It answered the immediate direct purpose of denying the human paternity of Jesus, and affirming for Him a divine paternity. When we speak, as we shall, of the motive or purpose in this, it is unnecessary to think of an explicit conscious intention on the part of the writers or of the Church. The truth shapes itself instinctively in the mind and expression of men, so that we often do not know why or how we say the things that are truest.

I cannot help pausing for a moment to point out once more what a number of wise sayings the passage I have been quoting contains, which are general in their bearing, and not confined to the particular topic under discussion. It is a real sage and seer who is speaking.

There is no part of the Gospels that has quite the poetic elevation of the Gospel of the Infancy. And yet what, at the last, one is most impressed with is its spiritual truth; if there is not the true instinct of the spirit there, in thought and language, it is nowhere to be found. Now what instinct of truth was it that in this effective way shaped the faith of the Gospel to the affirmation of not a human but a divine paternity of our Lord? I venture to say, that at any living point or period of Christianity the Christian consciousness concerning Jesus Christ would instinctively and necessarily have come to the practical conclusion embodied in the artless and poetical stories of the birth and infancy of Jesus. The profound speculative question really though invisibly at issue in and decided by them is this: Who and What is Jesus Christ, in His real and essential personality? The answer which this artless, and yet most profoundly artful, so-called nursery myth forestalls and excludes is this, He was no [?] mere natural offspring of Joseph and Mary. Why not? Because the product of every such natural union is an individual human person. Viewing Jesus Christ in that light it is impossible to construe Him otherwise than as a human individual, exceptionally favored by unique relations with God. The question for the Church then, as for the Church now or at any time, is, Can we, in the light of all that Jesus Christ is to the Church and to humanity, His universality, sufficiency, and ubiquity, can we, I say, be fully and finally satisfied to see in Him only one of the sons of men peculiarly favored and most highly endowed? I must confess for one, that however confronted and impressed with the rational and natural difficulties which we are about to meet in the opposite view, it is equally impossible for me not to be a Christian, or to be one under the conception of such a manhood of Jesus as the above. And I believe that in so saying I am expressing the normal Christian instinct and experience of the world. (pp. 211-213.)

It goes without saying that this conception of a humanity which is not that of an individual man is difficult. To understand it at all we need to bring in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Moberly warns us that the relation of Christ to the race "was not a differentiating, but a consummating

relation. He was not generically, but inclusively, man." (*A. and P.* p. 86). The medium of this inclusiveness is the Spirit. It is through the Spirit of the Incarnate that the effects of the Incarnation are diffused among men.

The nearest analogy is that of Adam—"the First Man" of 1 Corinthians xv. 47. But Dr. Moberly points out that the comparison is far from adequate.

It is valid as an illustration, but remains on a different, and dissimilar, level. The one is a fleshly relation, the other a spiritual. The one works automatically, materially, mechanically. The other is realized in a different sphere, and depends upon other than material conditions. The one is a natural property of bodily life, and follows, as it were blindly, from the fact that Adam was the original parent. The other is a Spiritual property, so sovereign, so transcendent, that it could only be a property of a Humanity which was not merely the Humanity of a finite creature, but the Humanity of the infinite God. (*Op. cit.* p. 89.)

This last phrase ("the Humanity of the infinite God") is one that would be entirely endorsed by Dr. Du Bose.

While I believe that there was nothing revealed or manifested to us in Jesus Christ, save the perfection of His humanity, yet I equally believe that in that perfection there was infinitely more than the humanity so perfected. In other words, I see in Jesus not only the supreme act of humanity in God, but the supreme act also of God in humanity. (*G. in GG.* p. 213.)

Nothing is more characteristic than the even way in which these two complementary predications are balanced and the thoroughgoing unhesitating logic with which both are asserted. Occasionally we meet with expressions which would be almost startling, if they were taken out of their context. For instance this :

Our Lord did not do that in our nature which no man within the limits of his own nature or by the exercise of only his own powers is capable of doing. He was not holy by nature, nor righteous by the law. The impossibilities of humanity were as much impossibilities for Him as for us. He bare all our weaknesses and carried all our sorrows. He had as much to hunger and thirst after a righteousness

which was not His own as we have, and He did it infinitely more. If He was actually holy and righteous as none but He was or is, it was because He was possessed, and humanly possessed of a higher secret, a truer way, a more sufficient power, of human holiness and righteousness than human nature in itself contains or human will can by itself acquire. . . . He was holy as a man and in the only way in which a man can be holy. He was holy by the conquest of sin. And this He was and did, as we too must be and do, after Him and in Him,—not within the limits of our own nature, nor by the powers of our own will (and yet not without these too), but through His all-sufficient way of perfect union and unity with God. (p. 163 f.)

This is one of the instances in which, though Dr. Moberly does not (I believe) use quite the same language, he yet explains the principle on which it is used.

Christ is, then, not so much God and man, as God in, and through, and as, man. He is one indivisible personality throughout. In His human life on earth, as Incarnate, He is not sometimes, but consistently, always, in every act and every detail, Human. The Incarnate never leaves His Incarnation. God, as man, is always, in all things, God *as man*. He no more ceases, at any point, to be God under methods and conditions essentially human; than, under these essentially human methods and conditions, He at any point ceases to be God. Whatever the reverence of their motive may be, men do harm to consistency and to truth, by keeping open, as it were, a sort of non-human sphere, or aspect, of the Incarnation. This opening we should unreservedly desire to close. There are not two existences either of or within, the Incarnate, side by side with one another. If it is all Divine, it is all human too. We are to study the Divine, in and through the human. By looking for the Divine side by side with the human, instead of discerning the Divine within the human, we miss the significance of them both. (*A. and P.* p. 96 f.)

The American and the English scholar are quite at one on this ground. As a rule they both keep closely to the lines of patristic divinity. This is eminently the case with regard to their teaching as to the nature of the humanity assumed by Christ. Dr. Du Bose more than once quotes Irenæus; and he has striking points of contact with the teaching of that father, and of St. Athanasius. But in the extracts just given there is a perceptible difference from the doctrine of

the Two Natures, as it is given (e.g.) in the Letter of Pope Leo to Flavian.

I have the impression that in this respect the moderns have really improved upon the ancients. The consequences of this re-statement are rather far-reaching. One of these may be seen in a passage by Dr. Du Bose, which is as near to a climax as anything in the book. But I will quote first a later passage, which serves to explain the earlier.

The hesitation and reluctance to see all God, and highest God, not only in the humanity but in the deepest human humiliation of Jesus Christ, *is part of the disposition to measure exaltation by outward circumstance and condition instead of by inward quality and character.* We find it impossible to recognize or acknowledge God in the highest act of His highest attribute. We cannot listen to the thought that it is with God as it is with us, that it only is with us because it is with God, that self-humiliation is self-exaltation. (p. 284.)

That is a kind of boldness that I do not think we should have found in any of the ancients. And I cannot help thinking that it is superior to the Kenotic teaching of many moderns. At any rate the application of it which follows is deeply impressive.

We speak of the incredible and impossible self-lowering or self-emptying of God in becoming man or in undergoing the death of the cross. Is the act in which love becomes perfect a contradiction or a compromise of the divine nature? Is God not God or least God in the moment in which He is most love? Where before Christ, or otherwise than in Christ, in whom He humbled Himself to become man, and then humbled Himself with and in man to suffer what man must needs suffer in order to become what God would fain make him—and the highest and best that even God can make him—I say where before Christ, or where now otherwise than in Christ and in the cross of the divine suffering together with and for man, where in all the story of the universe was or is love so love, or God so God! (p. 272 f.)

V.

I hope it will not be thought that I have been too copious in quotations. I have been very anxious to let Dr. Du Bose

speak—and speak adequately—for himself. I desire to give my readers an idea of what his book really is. I have the feeling that a few samples, which are really characteristic, will be better than much description, even if I could trust myself to describe with sufficient accuracy. And I did not consider myself called upon to resist the temptation to place a great English book by the side of a great American. The epithet is one that I will take the risk of giving to both.

At the same time my readers will kindly remember that what I have given them has been only samples. Dr. Du Bose's book is full of good things at which I have been unable even to hint. To do it justice, it should be read carefully, and read through, from beginning to end. If the specimens I have given should arouse in any one the instinct of opposition, that may be perhaps partly because I have given prominence to what lay most outside the beaten track. But the reader may be assured that there is a great deal beside this which is said with admirable freshness and force.

But the thing that perhaps strikes me most in the book is the wholly unconscious (i.e. un-selfconscious) loftiness and largeness of the point of view. The work is that of a serenely contemplative mind—a mind that has fixed a long and steady gaze upon its great theme until the outlines stood out luminous and clear. The writer of this book has had the whole of Christianity before him. Like Jacob at Peniel, he has wrestled with its meaning, not excitedly or passionately, but “in the quietness of thought”; and his patience has had its reward.

I will just give a last illustration of the largeness and comprehensiveness of view of which I have spoken. We might call it nothing less than a definition of Christianity.

I would describe Christianity in its largest sense to be the fulfilment of God in the world through the fulfilment of the world in God.

This assumes that the world is completed in man, in whom also God is completed in the world. And so, God, the world, and man are at once completed in Jesus Christ—who, as He was the *logos* or thought of all in the divine foreknowledge of the past, so also is He the *telos* or end of all in the predestination of the future. That is to say, the perfect psychical, moral, and spiritual manhood of which Jesus Christ is to us the realization and the expression is the end of God in creation, or in evolution. I hold that neither science, philosophy, nor religion can come to any higher or other, either conjecture or conclusion, than that. (p. 274.)

When we have thus adequately conceived Christ as the universal truth and reality of ourselves, and in ourselves of all creation, and in creation and ourselves of God, then we are prepared for the conclusion that we know God at all, or are sons to Him as our Father, or are capable in that relation of partaking of His nature or entering into His Spirit or living His life, only in and through Jesus Christ; because Jesus Christ is the incarnation or human expression to us of the whole *Logos* of God—that is to say, of God Himself as in any way whatever knowable or communicable. (p. 279.)

We may turn this round and express it, no longer in the terms of reasoned theory, but in those of religious experience, as follows :

Jesus Christ has not come so much to create the kingdom of God without us, as to create within us the power to see it. I am come, He says, that they which see not may see. What He saw and what He would have us see is : all the eternal love that God the Father is, *ours* ; all the infinite grace that God the Son is, *ours* ; all the perfect fellowship or oneness with ourselves that God the Holy Ghost is, *ours*. If all this is *ours*, then all things are *ours*, and all blessedness is indeed *ours*. (p. 96.)

It would not be easy to end on a more characteristic or a finer note than that.

W. SANDAY.

THE THEOLOGY OF ALBRECHT RITSCHL :

A LECTURE.

RITSCHLIANISM, it is safe to say, is both the most characteristic and the most fascinating product of what we call, distinctively, "modern theology." The master himself exerted an influence unrivalled by that of any other contemporary divine, and the contributions which have been made by members of his school to the intellectual heritage of Christianity have been in many cases of the most brilliant and stimulating kind. Whatever criticisms have been passed on the Ritschlian Dogmatic, no one who cared for theology has been tempted to say that it was ever uninteresting. It evoked too keen and heart-felt approbation, too bitter and resolute dissent, for any one to say that. To-day, seventeen years after Ritschl's death, the dust of battle has for the most part subsided ; yet discussions of the problems upon which it was his habit to dwell appear still in the magazines. The echoes of controversy linger on. Wherever you find a paper on "Value-judgments in Religion," or "Theology and Metaphysics," the chances are that the writer means to debate the question more or less as Ritschl threw it into shape.

In the brief hour at our disposal to-day I wish to consider four points : (1) Ritschl's theological method, (2) his conception of the source and norm of Dogmatic Theology, (3) his correction, in these matters, of the past, (4) his view of the essence of Christianity. Of these in order very briefly.

I. Ritschl's sober and impressive argument for *a new theological method* is probably, after all, his best and most permanent achievement. For plainly, if it has been given to him to strike out a new line, a principle rich in doctrinal possibilities, it is a minor question whether his own

application of the new idea was quite successful. We are free to essay any better application we can devise. So far from our being bound to accept merely the results it yielded in his hands, it lies with us to attempt a more fruitful interpretation of ideas which, as it is easy to imagine, he may have had too short time to work out fully. Now this new method is represented by his theory of religious knowledge as a system of value-judgments. It is because they unanimously fix upon the idea of value-judgments, as the feature by which religious is to be differentiated from scientific knowledge, that the members of the Ritschlian school, with all their free and even wide divergence, may justly be classed together as constituting a "movement." Adumbrations of this view are, no doubt, to be found in the works of Kant, Schleiermacher, and especially Lotze ; but it is really to Ritschl and Herrmann that the prominence of the conception in modern thought is traceable. In a well known passage Ritschl divides the judgments we make into two classes—*theoretical* judgments, which predicate certain relations of an object, considered as it exists in its own nature ; and *value-judgments*, in which its worth or interest for the Self is affirmed, according to the pleasure or pain it excites in the percipient. Theoretical judgments enter into science and philosophy ; judgments of value are constitutive in ethics, æsthetics, religion. The distinction, of course, is one to which ethical literature has accustomed us ; almost every writer upon moral philosophy speaks familiarly of the difference between a judgment *of* fact and a judgment *upon* fact, illustrating the point by the contrast between "judgment" in its logical sense of proposition and "judgment" in its judicial meaning of sentence. To take an example, "Abraham Lincoln died of a pistol wound" is a judgment of fact : "it was a cowardly assassination" is a judgment of worth, since it affirms the ethical quality or

character of the fact, and regards that quality not as something imposed upon the data by the mind, but as found in them, and objectively apprehended. Carry this distinction over to the domain of religious truth, and practically you have the Ritschlian theory. Thus "Jesus Christ died upon the Cross" is a judgment of fact only; it is a statement to which the pure historian may assent: "we have redemption through His blood" is a judgment of value or of personal conviction. It expresses what we find in the fact, the attitude we take up to it; our appreciation of it, in short, as bearing upon our personal life and affecting will and feeling. Now in Ritschl's view our theology ought to contain nothing but such statements of appreciation, issuing with conviction from the living faith of a Christian mind. "It is the duty of theology," he writes, "to conserve this special characteristic of the conception of God, that it can only be represented in value-judgments." Into the system of doctrine we must permit nothing to enter which we grasp solely by the intellect; truth, so far as it is genuinely religious truth, is apprehensible by faith alone; of which reason is certainly an element, but an element subdued to the medium it works in.

Every one sees immediately the objection which was certain to be made to all this. It was certain to be said, and it was said, with every variety of tone: Is this doctrine of value-judgments not simply a new and more elaborate way of saying that men, at all events if they are Christian men, may believe what they like? Is it not a roundabout fashion of proving that not only is the wish father to the thought, but in religion it ought to be? The answer given by Ritschl and his followers was quite clear. No, they said; value-judgments are just as objectively valid and trustworthy as those we put into the theoretical class; what we desire to insist on is simply that the mind reaches a persuasion of their

truth by a different avenue. A judgment of value is a judgment of fact as well. It elicits the spiritual meaning of a reality, but the reality must first be *given* in objective experience. As it has been admirably expressed, "there is a power of spiritual vision and there is a sense of spiritual value"; and the two act and react on each other. Science and faith appeal to different mental faculties and interests; and when Christ said, "every one that is of the truth heareth My voice," He taught the necessity of moral affinity to Him in will and desire, if not yet in settled character, ere men can appreciate Him, or perceive the decisive meaning of His advent and cross for their relation to God. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. The man who does not long to be good is inevitably blind to the existence of the Gospel; he cannot see what the New Testament is for. The truth that God is love, or that duty is supreme, or that Christ is Saviour, or that there is life after death is not equally transparent, or equally worth believing, to the profligate and the saint. These are things which only faith can grasp. Well, said Ritschl, let us take this principle—by which every preacher goes, by which we all go in private religion—and let us work it out consistently as a determinative principle of theology. Put into the doctrinal system nothing except that which we need faith to lay hold of.

The general truth of all this being granted, however, there remains behind the very fair question whether this new method of religious thought has yet attained to full command of itself. And on examination we have a right to say, I think, that it still requires to be so developed, and still waits to be so handled, as to do completer justice to the fundamental verities of New Testament teaching and the certainties of the Christian mind. Nevertheless, it marks a real gain, surely, that theology should frankly concede that the main question we have to ask in

regard to each point of doctrine is this : What does faith in Jesus Christ assure us of, what does it implicitly affirm, as to this topic ? This is the main question ; since dogmatic is properly the science of Christian faith. Hence Ritschl's principle is that faith ought to rely more upon itself ; it ought to concentrate the issues, and simply drop out what past experience has shown to be irrelevant. After all faith lives, moves, grows, not by the sufferance of philosophy and science, but by inner reasons and forces of its own.

Or, to express the same truth in different terms—and this will lead us on to the second point of the four—we must guard against the error of interpreting judgments of faith as if they were mere postulates. A postulate is a belief of a quite definite kind ; it is a belief whose truth we posit, or affirm, solely on account of its value. If a man says, I believe this or that dogma is true, because unless it were true, life would be intolerable, that man is making a postulate. Now Ritschl would insist upon it that Christian doctrines, although they may be (or at least be founded upon) value-judgments, are not postulates in that sense. In making judgments of faith, we are by no means reduced to the futile policy of arguing from the presence of a desire in the human heart to the reality of a corresponding object. The reality on which our trust is set exists in perfect objectivity apart from all our hopes and wishes ; it is given in historical revelation, as concentrated in, if not confined to, the Person of Jesus Christ. In Him is to be found a standard of truth to which the religious mind ought to conform. And this brings us to the second point.

II. *The source and norm of Christian doctrine.* I have already indicated what this is for Ritschl ; it is the Christian revelation, as authentically presented to the mind of the Church in the New Testament. The New Testament is com-

posed (roughly speaking) of original documents out of the first Christian generation ; it shows the common faith of the Church as it existed in its purity before influences of a confusing kind had made themselves felt—influences, for example, emanating from Greek Philosophy or the Oriental Mysteries, such as we perceive must have touched and affected the beliefs of the second century. Two mistakes should be avoided at this point, we are told. First, it is a mistake to confine ourselves to the Gospels, or to speak as though no doctrine could legitimate itself for the believer unless it were derivable from express statements of Christ. Inspiration apart, the gospel of the Apostles also is authoritative for us ; that is, you can judge accurately who Jesus was, and what He meant to achieve by His life and death, by inference from the impression He produced on His disciples. The cause may be studied in its effects, as well as in itself. And secondly, we are not bound to every doctrinal statement in the New Testament ; what we are bound to is the gospel in the New Testament. Scripture is to be regarded, not as a law, a rigid, external code of belief imposed from without on the Christian mind, but rather as a great confession of faith, which we discover experimentally to be capable of awakening in us a spontaneous echo of its message of Christ Jesus the Lord.

In other words, for Ritschl the revelation that is in Scripture, and pre-eminently in the New Testament, has its focus and living heart in the Person of Jesus Christ ; in Him the gospel dwells bodily. Christ, to use the technical language of philosophy, is the *ratio cognoscendi* of religious truth. What we see in Him—what we gather from the total impression which His Person, living and dying, makes upon us—ought to set the tone of all doctrinal belief. Nothing is to be tolerated in Dogmatic which does not square with that.

The principle is one which is to be applied even to the books of Scripture. Here Ritschl formed his theory upon the famous words of Luther : “The true touchstone by which to test all books is whether they are instinct with Christ or no ; for the whole of Scripture must witness to Christ, even as Paul would know nothing save Christ only. What does not teach Christ, is not apostolic, even though Peter or Paul had said it ; on the other hand, what does preach Christ is apostolic, even though we had it from Judas, Annas, Herod, or Pilate.” Or, to view the subject on a different side, revelation, says Ritschl, just because it and faith—i.e. inward trust—answer closely to each other, is always a personal thing. It always comes to men through great personalities. Not through imposing institutions has God dealt with us for our redemption, but through men, and above all through the Man Christ Jesus. Dogmatic Theology, therefore, is simply the scientific and systematized interpretation of what God in Christ has revealed Himself to be. To this revelation, with the forgiveness of sins standing out in the foreground, the fit response on our part is faith—faith, not as belief in historical facts, not as the meek acceptance of dogma, but as confident trust in a God of grace. Ritschl fought all his life against the idea that saving faith is submission to a number of doctrines or acceptance of a series of propositions about the past. In this, of course, he was not singular ; but he was singular, many of his followers declare, not without justice, in the persistency and decisive force with which he urged that the historic fact of Christ is the revelation of God, indispensable and all-sufficient. Our idea of God, he kept on saying, must start from Christ, not from nature. A Person can only be made known through a person. In Christ a life was realized, and put within the reach of believers, which triumphantly overcomes the troubles of a refractory world, by making every

experience subsidiary to a divine faith and divine ends. No verse of Scripture was more habitually on Ritschl's lips than the great word of Romans viii. : " We know that all things work together for good to them that love God " ; and he never wearied of insisting that its truth can be felt only by those who have believed in God as He comes to us in Christ. Only the Christian knows that he is inseparably one with God. Only the Christian has the right to trust absolutely in Providence, and to say, in the words of the old German hymn :

Now I know and believe,
And give praise without end,
That God the Almighty
Is Father and Friend.
And that in all troubles,
Whatever betide,
He hushes the tempest,
And stands by my side.¹

Two of the most characteristic features of Ritschl's thought are, I think, the direct result of this all but exclusive emphasis upon the Person of Christ. First, his distaste for anything that savours of natural theology. He has little love for the effort to lay a basis for Christianity in arguments which stand clear of the specifically Christian experience. To paraphrase an untranslatable German expression, you can't demonstrate Christianity into a man's mind. The famous proofs of the being of God start from outside the Christian faith, and therefore they can never bring you inside. They prove a Supreme Being, perhaps ; but the idea of a Supreme Being is not enough for the man who wants to be forgiven, or to win mastery over life. For that the God we have in Christ is needful. Nor can this God be grasped in any other way than by personal surrender. No amount of purely logical evidence can pro-

¹ Cf. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 271.

duce that faith, that childlike yet manly trust, out of which spring the energy and joy of Christian life. Here we see Ritschl's instinct for historical revelation coming out, hyperbolically, as an aversion to natural theology in every form. Christianity, he would plead, stands by itself; and only in Jesus Christ can you have the truth which makes it what it is.

The second example which I will adduce is Ritschl's dislike of mysticism, and of its sister phenomenon, pietism. His complaint against the mystic is, briefly, that in rising up to God, and holding fellowship with Him, he transcends, or ignores, the historical Mediator. He claims to enjoy an immediate contact of the soul with God, all intervening helps and succours being passed over in a kind of thankless neglect, as if once we have climbed to a height we did well to cast away the ladder which made the ascent possible. This, Ritschl finds, all genuine mystics do. Hence the gospel of the New Testament and the means of grace eventually mean little or nothing for them. They cut themselves loose from the fellowship of the Church which Jesus Christ made it the work of His life and death to found; or they indulge in an irreverent familiarity with the Saviour which has deplorable ethical consequences; and in both cases they act as if they were superior to revelation, had got beyond it, looked upon it as only milk for spiritual babes; in short, as if they were now in possession of a better and esoteric knowledge of Christ in His exaltation. But many of Ritschl's best friends would now concede that in his polemic against mysticism he went a great deal too far, indeed at times went very near to deny outright the immediate relation of the believer to the Risen Lord. The incident of "the thorn in the flesh," recorded in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, with its directness of converse between St. Paul and the living Christ, is enough to prove that

Ritschl had in this matter somewhat misconceived the view, or rather the certainty, of the apostles. And Herrmann's entire theology is a kind of implicit refutation of his master on the point. No one has spoken more worthily than he of the secret, the incommunicable, the genuinely mystical, factors which needs must be found in every Christian experience modelled upon New Testament religion.

The results, then, which we have reached under this head are these. The revelation with which the New Testament is charged is constitutive for Dogmatic. This revelation, in its essence, is the Person of Jesus Christ as it has impressed the mind of believers—above all, the mind of the original, and, so to say, classical believers of the primitive generation. Jesus' supreme design was to found the kingdom of God, and what He meant by that we see in the faith and life He evoked in the disciples. Revelation and trust are intrinsically relative to each other; hence the theologian's task is not to speculate freely, or at large, but to make explicit the contents of faith. As Ritschl puts it expressly: "We must not admit into Dogmatic anything which it is impossible to use in preaching, or in the fellowship of Christians with each other."

III. *His relation to the past.* Now that we have before us the new theological method associated with our author's name, as well as his conception of the source and norm of Dogmatic, we are better qualified to reach a true conclusion as to his place in the doctrinal history of the nineteenth century. At present, I can only speak of his relation first to Schleiermacher, next to Hegel. From Schleiermacher, he accepted the great principle that religion is a thing by itself, *sui generis*, not to be confused with morality, still less with science; but a genuinely independent force in human life, which calls out and combines in its service all the powers of

mind. As it has been put, by religion "feeling is stirred, the heart and thoughts are suffused, and a vehicle is found in the will." It is true, Ritschl declines to say with Schleiermacher that religion is feeling, the feeling of unconditional dependence. For him the chief stress, in the life of religion, is laid on the will ; for it springs from the practical necessities of the human situation. To quote words which come as near a definition as any : "The religious view of the world, in all its forms, rests on the fact that man in some degree distinguishes himself in worth from the phenomena which surround him, and from the influences of nature which press in upon him." That is to say, the absolute value of personality, as we are conscious of it in ourselves, craves and indeed postulates such a supernatural government of the universe as shall protect and develop personal life. Morality is doomed to defeat if there be no God. We must believe religiously if we are to live the good life with a sure and certain hope. Ritschl also took over from Schleiermacher the conviction that religion is essentially a social thing, propagating itself by human contact and example. Faith is the common possession of believers, making them one, constituting them a Church ; and the theologian, if he is to speak to any purpose, and with any prospect of being listened to, must speak as a convinced member of the Church. With the theologizing of the dilettante Ritschl had no patience at all.

Yet there was a strain in the theology of Schleiermacher by which the later thinker felt himself repelled ; I mean his imperfect sense of history, his sentimentality or subjectivism. We must never forget that Ritschl was a Church historian before he turned to Dogmatic ; and he always retained a profound and exacting feeling for the objectively real. To him the Christian religion was nothing unless it was a historical religion, with its roots deep in the facts of the past.

Schleiermacher, on the other hand, had laid it down that doctrinal propositions are not statements about what is objectively known, but merely descriptions of pious states of mind. They are the result of the contemplation of our feelings. Ritschl could not bear this: it seemed to him to cut us off from the trustworthy contents of history, and to deliver us up to the mystic, bound hand and foot. Hence, while completely at one with Schleiermacher in believing that the theologian must take his stand, frankly and unequivocally, upon the distinctively Christian experience, thus construing faith from the inside, he insists, as against his predecessor, that in the interpretation of our religion we must go back, at every successive point, to the fixed historical revelation given once for all in Christ. Not, of course, that Ritschl would have questioned that Dogmatic has to do with subjective experiences; for him, as for other people, it is the science of Christian faith. But what he insists upon—and modern theology has taken some pains to learn the lesson—is that these experiences, this faith and life, are evoked and developed by a particular object emergent in the past, viz., the Person of the historical Jesus, as presented in the believing witness of the New Testament. As he might have put it: Dogmatic has to express, to interpret and formulate, not merely the experiences which we actually have, but those which, in view of the salvation offered to us in Jesus, we *ought* to have. What ultimately concerns us is not the individual opinion of the average Christian; not even the official opinion of the Church to which we belong; but that which is urged upon the mind by the realities of history. We want to know who and what Jesus really is, and what He can be, or can give, to the soul that is surrendered to Him in faith. It is of relatively minor importance to inquire how much, in our lukewarmness and apathetic mistrust, we have as yet received from

God ; the point is rather what we might have received, and what the gift of God in Christ properly is. In a word, we are asked to respond to the gospel with *the obedience of faith*, recognizing that there are disclosures of God in Jesus to which our mind has submissively to adjust itself, and by which, as a standard from which there is no appeal, all the doctrines of tradition must be tested and corrected. In the Person of Christ this revelation has been adequately deposited in history. It was a clear recognition of this fact, Ritschl felt, carried uniformly into every part of the field of truth, which alone could give to the dogmatic system the organic unity it seemed to him, so far, to lack.

So again with Hegel. What offended Ritschl in the imposing construction of Christianity which we owe to Hegelianism, was that the greater portion of it had nothing particular to do with Jesus Christ. It was the Christian religion with the living soul of it left out. The simple fact that in his deduction of the Trinity Hegel took the Son as signifying, not Christ, but the finite world as such, must have been enough to excite the permanent suspicion of a mind like Ritschl's. Many more than he, indeed, were feeling, in these mid years of last century, that in Hegel's hands religion had become too much a matter of speculative thought, too little one of feeling and act. As in the days of the Gnostics, faith had been made the business of the school, rather than of the simple believer, wherever he is found. To the speculative philosopher, Christianity is only one religion among many—a species within a broader genus ; to Ritschl—and here, surely, he spoke for us all—it stands by itself. As it has been expressed : “ Instead of seeing in Christianity with Hegel the crown of a religion of nature more or less perfectly manifesting itself wherever the religious life exists at all, he calls attention to the uniqueness of Christianity as a phenomenon without parallel.” The truth is, whatever we may

think of Ritschl's treatment of particular miracles, there has been no theologian in the past more radically and unfalteringly convinced than he of the supernatural character of revelation as a whole, or less enamoured of the efforts made from time to time to deduce the Christian religion from the conditions of epoch and country out of which it rose. He believed that Hegel had obscured, or rather simply eliminated, the creative personality of Jesus Christ; thus blurring the great elemental facts of history by *a priori* speculation, and weaving garlands of dialectic about the specifically Christian doctrines, till their connexion with the faith of the New Testament was lost to sight. In taking this line he spoke out of what he later felt to be a somewhat bitter experience. His student years had closed, leaving him an ardent Hegelian; and it was only after long toil and pain, we learn, that he groped his way out of the labyrinth.

IV. *The essence of Christianity.* Ritschl's mind upon this subject is less clearly expressed than it might be; but on the whole our best plan is to start from the definition of Christianity we find stated with some care in the Introduction to vol. iii. of his *Justification and Reconciliation*. "Christianity," he writes, "is the monotheistic, completely spiritual and ethical religion, which, based on the life of its author as Redeemer and as Founder of the Kingdom of God, consists in the liberty of the children of God, is instinct with the impulse to love-prompted action aiming at the ethical organization of humanity, and finds blessedness on the relation of sonship to God as also on the Kingdom of God." No one would maintain that the sense of this complex form of words is immediately obvious; but we can do a good deal to elucidate the meaning by picking out three central ideas, and studying them a little more closely. We are the more encouraged to attempt this selection, that Ritschl always

declined to derive Christianity from a single germinative principle. For while he held that the Christian religion does indeed give us a rounded and consistent view of the world, this did not mean for him that you can spin Christianity—complete in all its parts and implicates—out of one pregnant idea. His respect for historical realities was too deep to permit *à priori* or purely logical constructions of that kind. Christian truth, he felt, is too many-sided to allow the totality to be packed into a single conception, however capacious or versatile; and the invariable result of making the experiment is that we do injustice to important elements of the whole. Thus he came habitually to look at Christianity from a variety of angles, lifting into relief now this one and now that of the vital principles which make it what it is. For example, a few sentences before the definition I have cited, we find the suggestive observation—one of the better known of Ritschl's dicta—that “Christianity resembles, not a circle described from a single centre, but an ellipse determined by two *foci*”; these *foci* being, he goes on to say, the ideas of redemption through Christ, which is a purely religious notion, and the Kingdom of God, which is construed as predominantly ethical. Again, there are not a few passages in which he urges that we understand Christianity best when we view it as a vital correlation, or perhaps rather a vital interaction, of revelation and faith. And once more, in still another passage, he recurs to illustrations from geometry, and this time argues that just as when three points of its circumference are given, a circle is given, so we may conceive of Christianity as being determined by the three ideas of God, Christ, and the Church. Hence I think we shall be in line with Ritschl's own modes of thought, and be likely to gain a fair view of his conclusions as to the essence of Christianity, if, from the definition already quoted, we single out these three ideas for scrutiny—Jesus

Christ, the Kingdom of God, and the liberty of God's children.

What is Ritschl's view of the Person of Christ? It is properly to be stated, as all religious doctrines, he holds, ought to be, in judgments of appreciation. Broadly, then, it may be said that he argues, by way of an impression of infinite spiritual value, from the divine character of the work Jesus Christ achieved to the divine character of His person. As it has been put, "to reach the worth of Christ he starts from the work of Christ," arriving ultimately at the conclusion that He is One who has for us the religious value of God. The movement of his thought, we gather, is something like the following. Our redemption, by the common consent of believers, flows from the supreme act of Christ in establishing His Church on earth. The fact that with perfect fidelity He discharged the vocation which the Father had assigned Him, consenting to suffer all that unbelief and hatred could devise rather than prove unfaithful, and exercising consummate patience even unto death—this fact is the basis on which the society gathered round Him is declared righteous; Christ being its representative, it has imputed to it the position, the relation to God, which Jesus held for Himself inviolably to the end. By His obedience He kept Himself in the love of God from first to last, thereby securing access to God and the forgiveness of sins for the whole company of His followers. He unites in Himself absolute revelation and perfect religion; accordingly, His functions—the relation He sustains on the one hand to God and on the other hand to us—being divine, we are justified in predicating divinity of Himself. Just as the older dogmatists found the evidence for Christ's *humanity* in certain human qualities which characterized Him, so, in a parallel way, Ritschl would prove His *divinity* from certain Godlike qualities in His life, such as His love, His

patience, His inner freedom, His grace and truth. Jesus inaugurated a new relation between God and man, He realized it in His own life, He reproduces it in all believers ; hence, in Herrmann's memorable phrase, to call Him divine is "only to give Him His right name." The confession of His Godhead is born of experience of His grace. In the formula of Melancthon, which Ritschl can never quote too often : *Hoc est Christum cognoscere, benevolentia eius cognoscere.*

It is impossible to deny that this vein is full of valuable ideas. It is good that we should have Christ's work in view when we are shaping a conception of His Person ; to know what He does for us is certain to throw light on what He is. It is good that our theory of the Incarnation should, as Luther used to say, *fein, sanft von unten anheben*—start from below, that is, and make a modest beginning from the facts of His historical life and work. It ought to be said plainly, however, that Ritschl has no monopoly of these suggestive and rewarding ideas ; they are part of the general stock with which the majority of believing divines in the nineteenth century have worked. One's real doubt is whether, despite the unimpeachable form of argument he adopts, our author really lets it carry him as far as it ought to. The ratiocination is as follows : If Christ does all for men that God could do, that must go to shape our thoughts of His person ; since, if life, grace, forgiveness are ours in Him, what is left for us to call Him if we refuse Him the name of God ? Now does Ritschl follow this mode of inference out to its final issues ? There lies the crucial point. On the one hand we have Professor Garvie's weighty and decided verdict : "When Ritschl calls the application of the predicate of divinity to Christ a value-judgment he does not mean that Christ is not God in reality, but that we imagine or represent Him to be God, either to cheat ourselves or to flatter Him . . . When he says that Christ has the *worth* of God, he is neither so much the fool

or the knave as to mean that Christ *is not* God ; but as a sincere and intelligent thinker he means that Christ is God.”¹ Of course neither Ritschl’s sincerity nor his intelligence is in dispute ; the question, like a hundred others, is one simply of accurate exegesis. I do not feel, however, that the matter is so transparently simple as Dr. Garvie thinks it to be, or that it can be settled merely by appealing to a theologian’s good faith. Take some significant facts upon the other side. Take the fact, for instance, of Ritschl’s deliberate enunciation of the principle that the Godhead of Christ must be capable of imitation by us ; which is really equivalent to saying that perfect man is, *ipso facto*, Divine. Or take again his complaint that the dogma of His pre-existence confers upon our Lord a dignity all His own, in which His people cannot participate. Not that Ritschl dreams of questioning the real uniqueness of Christ : “Christ,” he says, “as the historical author of the fellowship of men with God and with one another is necessarily, in His own order, unique.” But he does not appear to me to have expressed this uniqueness of being in language which lifts it quite clear of the suggestion of a merely chronological, and hence fortuitous, priority. This harmonizes with his attitude to the kindred idea of pre-existence, of which his treatment is extremely characteristic ; for while not denying it, he declines to give it any attention, or to allow it any place in the doctrinal system, on the plea that we have no concern with the pre-existent Christ, but only with the life which began at Bethlehem. This seems to me eminently a case in which agnostic presuppositions pass easily into negative dogmatism. It is not difficult to agree that “we must first be able to prove the Godhead that is revealed before we take account of the Godhead that is eternal” ; the facts of revelation, as every one concedes, must be in the foreground from first to

¹ *The Ritschlian Theory*, p. 267.

last ; yet it turns out that Ritschl never really takes account of "the Godhead that is eternal," the discussion of which he here professes only to postpone. To any attempt to state Christ's pre-existence in positive terms he uniformly opposes the prohibitive idea of its "mystery" ; nevertheless I do not find that the "mystery" of it restrains him from *negative* conclusions. Like Schultz, in his valuable treatise *Die Gotttheit Christi*, his finding is that value-judgments, although incapable of yielding a single metaphysical affirmation, may be so construed as to yield various metaphysical denials. I cannot but think that this patent inconsistency comes simply of an unfortunate prejudice. The mere refusal to embark upon speculations about our Lord's pre-existence, so far from being mistaken, may even be regarded as meritorious ; but what, personally, I feel to be chiefly lacking in the Ritschlian system is a frank recognition of the great New Testament certainty that in Christ's coming to earth at all, and not merely in the carrying out of His earthly vocation, a glorious and overwhelming proof has been given of the love—the self-sacrifice, if you will—alike of the Father and of the Son. In a word, Ritschl has no place in his Dogmatic for the truth of 2 Corinthians viii. 9 : "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor" ; and it will not do to speak as though the Christian religion remains exactly what it was when this soul-subduing conception has been dropped out.

Time forbids me to touch upon the other two points except in the briefest way. The Kingdom of God is for Ritschl an idea, or rather a reality, of the first religious magnitude, ranking in importance, indeed, above the individuals who compose it. It is to the community, not to the individual soul, that forgiveness, justification, access to God are given ; at all events in the first place. The Kingdom of

God is the Christian society in its *rôle* as a universal and cosmopolitan association, permeated by the spirit of love and service. Essentially it is not *either* religious or ethical ; it is both. As the Germans put it, it is both *Gabe* and *Aufgabe*, a gift of God, and therefore religious, and a task for man, and therefore ethical. No one has ever taught more unweariedly than Ritschl the social nature of Christianity. For him it was a community, a Church, that Jesus came to found ; and His relation to individuals is subordinate to that. It is scarcely doubtful that in this Ritschl departed from genuinely Reformation doctrine, yet his protest against a false individualism was both Christian and timely.

Finally, true freedom is to be found in Christ only. Liberty, action, obedience, the mastery of life—these are great words with Ritschl ; in Christ, he was perpetually saying, we are independent of the world as being one with God, and partakers of His supramundane life. It was one of his deepest convictions that we possess a faith which is worthy of the name only when we are living it out in the activities of the service of God. Perhaps his favourite text of Scripture was one to which F. W. Robertson of Brighton also turned with a peculiar instinct : “ If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.” Ritschl was a masculine theologian, if ever any one deserved to be called so ; sentiment he was perhaps too apt to disparage ; for his way, to borrow Herrmann’s descriptive words, was “ to speak sharply and exactly of what moved his heart.” Religion, he saw, is not a mere feeling. It is a force ; it is *power* ; it makes us in Christ masters of the world, because God’s freemen.

These then are, in brief outline, the central points of the system of Ritschl. It is little to say that they betray certain

marks of imperfection, and that some great things in Christianity have escaped him ; this is only to complain that he is human. It is far more important to note that he, and those who learnt from him, have wonderfully freshened the whole dogmatic field. This is the result probably of the rich suggestiveness of his two main ideas : first, that religious knowledge is the knowledge of a religious man—of a man who is experientially aware of the value of divine things—not the frigid inference of a disinterested looker-on ; secondly, that the centre of real Christianity is the historic Christ. If we learn from him to be resolute and thorough in the application of these conceptions for ourselves, it may be we shall succeed in deriving from them results more consonant with New Testament truth than he attained. In that case, like all great teachers, he will have educated us beyond himself.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE first "official" account of Jesus' life began with the ministry in Galilee "after the baptism which John preached" (Acts x. 37). The latter is the first point at which the four Gospels fall into line (Matt. iii. 11, 16 ; Mark i. 7, 8, 10 ; Luke iii. 16, 22 ; John i. 15, 26-7, 32-3 ; Acts xiii. 25). In St. Mark it is the actual "beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" (Mark i. 1) ; but St. Matthew and St. Luke first give some account of Jesus' birth. St. John has instead the divine generation of the Word, and then gives much matter of his own touching the Baptist ; but the whole of chapters i.-v. seems practically to precede the opening of the Galilaean ministry as in the Synoptics.

The Synoptic narrative merely gives the vital facts : John's preaching, his heralding and baptizing of Jesus.

Probably during the temptation (John i. 26) the deputation from Jerusalem arrives. Jesus' appearance in John i. 29 cannot be the occasion of His baptism, for after two days He goes to Cana in Galilee, near His old home at Nazareth. After the wedding feast he stays at Capharnaum "not many days" (John ii. 12), and then goes to Jerusalem for the Passover, after which he baptizes in Judea. This journey to Galilee, therefore, is not that of Matthew iv. 12; Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14: the Baptist is still at large (John iv. 22 ff.), the stay at Capharnaum as in St. John is too short, and it is rather John iv. 1 which points to the arrest of John and peril to Jesus Himself (cf. Luke xiii. 31). After the Passover, then, Jesus baptizes in Judaea near John till the latter's arrest, yet not long. For the harvest of barley began immediately after the Passover, that of wheat after the feast of Pentecost (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Messiah*, Book iii. c. xxxv. vol. ii. p. 53), and "the wheat was ripe for harvesting, when he passed through Samaria" (ibid. pp. 54, 55). This rendering of John iv. 35 ff. is of course disputed; we cannot do more here than briefly notice some arguments for it. Most Jews understood Greek; this seems clear from Acts xxii. 2, and from Pilate's proceedings throughout. A catchy iambic line like—

ἔτι τετράμηνος, καὶ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται,

an encouragement amid the hungry waiting for the harvest, much like our "only a mile more," might well have been picked up from the Greek population. Or we might suppose a feeling that the critical time had now come, comparing Amos iv. 7. St. Paul had Greek verses running in his head (Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33). Moreover, the vivid details of John iv. 35-6 themselves make it hard for us to imagine ourselves in the middle of December; and John iv. 45 would lead us to suppose that the Galilaeans

and Jesus Himself were only lately returned from the Passover. Finally, this view makes it easier to explain why the Synoptics do not mention the Passover; Jesus' disciples may not as yet have been intimate enough to keep close to His side. And if this date be accepted, little difficulty will be felt in referring John v. 1 to Pentecost. This does not seem to take Jesus back to Judaea too soon. On the contrary, it allows time for some of the events of Mark i. 14, ii. 22.¹

The Passover and, as we suppose it to be, the Pentecost in Jerusalem, connect with what we may call the third part, chapters vii.-xi., the first part being chapters i.-v. St. John, like St. Luke, gives much quite peculiar to himself before coming to the common ground of the Passion and Resurrection, and his definite purpose seems to be to throw light on the increasing friction between Jesus and the Jerusalem authorities. This he does by a full account of the Feast of Tabernacles, and of the raising of Lazarus; the account of the Dedication is very short. Matthew xxiii., with the short parallels in Mark xii. 38-40 and Luke xx. 45-7, and the passages in Luke xi., together with Luke xiii. 34-5, show the other aspect of the quarrel; the Synoptics' presentation of the Johannine aspect will be touched on presently. Even the Synoptics' omission of the raising of Lazarus is not wholly inexplicable. The family was doubtless especially well known to St. John; Lazarus was also "he whom Thou lovest" (John xi. 3). It is in the light of this fact that we have to resolve the difficulties, not merely as to the feast at Bethany (John xii. 1-11; Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9), but also as to the apparitions after the Resurrection. St. John was in touch with Mary Magdalene on the very day itself (John xx. 2), and his

¹ The reading *Ἰουδαίας* in Luke iv. 44 seems to point to the "first circuit" as the time of the Pentecost journey.

account of her proceedings is full and accurate, and in large measure peculiar to himself. In the same way St. Luke is peculiarly well informed about Joana (Luke xxiv. 10, viii. 3), and indeed about what concerns Herod Antipas in general: for besides Matthew xiv. 1–12, Mark vi. 14–29, corresponding to Luke iii. 19, 20, ix. 7–9, and Mark viii. 15 (“the leaven of Herod”) there is no further question of him in St. Matthew or St. Mark; but St. Luke is concerned with him not only in the above passages, and in Luke iii. 1, for the date, but in Luke xiii. 31–3, xxiii. 5–12; Acts iv. 27, xiii. 1.

John v. leaves us somewhere about June; chapter vi. gives us the following Passover, for which, as we shall see, Jesus did not come to Jerusalem, but went northwards instead; chapter vii. is concerned with the Feast of Tabernacles, in the September following. If Jesus did not come up for the Passover, we might infer that He did not come up for any other feast; and the Gospel itself makes the inference certain, by the close connexion which it establishes between the incidents in chapters v., vii. The word *ὑγιής* is used five times in the incident in chapter v., otherwise in St. John only in John vii. 23. Further, there is a reference to the Jews’ seeking to kill Jesus (John vii. 1, v. 18), to which indeed He Himself refers, not merely when speaking to them (John vii. 19), but also when answering His brethren, who are obviously displeased at His long absence from Jerusalem and Judaea (John vii. 3–9; cf. also vii. 10, *οὐ φανερώς ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ*).

The Feast of Tabernacles was the beginning of the end. St. John’s view as to the chief cause of the crisis is unmistakable, and at the moment of the crisis it is brought home to us with dramatic force (John xviii. 5–6). In John v. 18—at Pentecost, we take it—it is because Jesus “makes Himself equal to God” that “the Jews sought the more to kill Him.”

Both at the Feast of Tabernacles and at the Dedication it is only an unmistakable assertion of His Godhead that makes them catch up the stones in their hands (John viii. 59, x. 31-3; cf. 38-9). Is it not in the light of all this that we should interpret Luke xxii. 70, and the nature of Jesus' "blasphemy" in the parallels in St. Matthew and St. Mark? At the Dedication Jesus interprets Himself as having called Himself "the Son of God" (John x. 36); so, in general, do the Jews (John xix. 7). St. John even writes his Gospel that the disciples may "believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John xx. 31).

The first Passover, then, the Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Dedication, the raising of Lazarus are landmarks in Jesus' relations with the Jerusalem authorities. In St. John the cleansing of the Temple is the beginning of friction, and can only be the beginning. May not the Synoptics have reserved for the end all that happened in Jerusalem itself? The number of words in St. John that more or less answer to the Synoptics is rather greater than we should expect if there were not some sort of common source in the background. Christ's words, too, are similar, though the Old Testament allusion (John ii. 16) may be rather Zechariah xiv. 21, in the Hebrew. We may notice that John xii. 15 follows the Hebrew of Zechariah ix. 9, the *waw* being epexegetic; whereas Matthew xxi. 5 follows the Septuagint.¹ If we accept the identification, it perhaps helps somewhat to explain the difficulty about the fig-tree (Matt. xxi. 18-22; Mark xi. 12-14, 20-24). We should notice, however, in favour of the place given to the cleansing of the Temple by St. Matthew and St. Mark the saying *Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν κτλ.*, misrepresented at Jesus' trial (Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58), under the cross (Matt. xxvii. 40; Mark xv. 29), and at St. Stephen's trial (Acts vi. 14). The

¹ Compare also John xix. 37, from the Hebrew of Zechariah xii. 10.

fact that the saying is vividly remembered makes for the later date, but by no means conclusively.

Between the Feast of Tabernacles, which has been called the beginning of the end, and the Pentecost, which, as we have seen, practically precedes the ministry as in the Synoptics, stands only chapter vi. This may be conveniently looked upon as the second part in St. John. He selects his matter from the whole of the Galilaean ministry, and we therefore expect his selection to be full of significance, nor are we disappointed. We may notice in passing that here, as in certain other parts, St. John shows himself an independent witness to the common Synoptic source. John vi. 15-21, compared to Matthew xiv. 22-33, Mark vi. 45-52, is especially noteworthy. To return. The chapter is significant as regards Jesus' relations with the Jerusalem authorities. He absents Himself from the Passover because there is danger to His life. This is clear from John vii. 1, and from the relation of chapter vii. to chapter v. as a whole, spoken of above. From the Synoptics, too, it is clear that Jesus soon left for the parts of Tyre and Sidon. The language of Matthew xiv. 34-6, Mark vi. 53-6 need not imply any long interval; rather we gather that the dispute about the unwashed hands, the immediate occasion of Jesus' retirement, occurred almost at once. St. Luke, again, goes straight from the feeding of the multitude to St. Peter's confession at Caesarea-Philippi (Matt. xvi. 13-9; Mark viii. 27-29; Luke ix. 18-20), and, if we identify with the latter John vi. 67-9, so does St. John. At the first Passover in His public life Jesus cleanses the Temple; at the second He is farther away from Jerusalem than ever before or after, and He is preparing the ministers of the New Law; at the third the Passover is fulfilled.

The chapter also marks a stage in Jesus' relations with the Galilaicans; it is in a manner the last scene in His Galilaean

ministry, the scene of His final rejection by them as a body. Afterwards He goes northward, and does not reappear in Galilee except again to depart. We have another feeding of the multitude, if on a smaller scale, and miracles; but for all that there is a steady desire to avoid publicity, and even when the Pharisees ask for a sign the harder saying about them is uttered to the disciples alone. He does not return from the north till Matthew xvii. 22, Mark ix. 30, Luke ix. 44. Once again we see from Mark ix. 30 that Jesus did not wish to be known. Luke ix. 43 seems to refer to the north. His departure for Galilee is formally announced in Matthew xix. 1-2, Mark x. 1, Luke ix. 51. St. Matthew and St. Mark make Him leave for the mountains of Judaea beyond the Jordan, whence He departs (Matt. xx. 17; Mark x. 32) for His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. St. John is silent as to Jesus' whereabouts between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Dedication, but makes Him retire across Jordan after the latter (John x. 40-42), and an active ministry is implied. We may identify, then, His final departure from Galilee in St. Matthew and St. Mark with that for the Feast of Tabernacles in St. John, and in the same way the stay beyond the Jordan; any other system of harmony seems more difficult. The *οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γινῶι* of Mark ix. 30 answers in a striking way to the *ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ* of John vii. 10. St. Luke, after giving the departure from Galilee, with Jerusalem as the objective, does not rejoin the first two Gospels till Luke xviii. 15. Some appear to think that the other three Gospels leave a gap in the chronology about here, only filled by St. Luke. But the long northern circuit, in the course of which Jesus "went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon into the Sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis" (Mark vii. 31), and the later journey to Caesarea Philippi,

seem sufficiently to fill up the time between the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles in September. The interval between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Dedication in December is not long, and after the latter, at the latest, until the raising of Lazarus, we have the three Synoptics again. We have said this much in order to make it plain that Luke xvii. 11 does not force us to suppose a later return to Galilee. It fixes an environment for the incident of the ten lepers which is necessary to make it intelligible, but it does not itself belong to any definite scheme of times and places. We shall not perhaps be wrong if we suppose St. Luke to be harking back to the actual journey for the Feast of Tabernacles. It is of course impossible in any case to suppose St. Luke to represent only one slow journey to Jerusalem for the last Passover; the Feast of Tabernacles and the Dedication have to be fitted in somehow.

This aspect of the crisis is represented by John vi. 66, a contrast to the Galilaeans' favourable reception of Jesus after the first Passover in John iv. 45. As to what St. John meant to represent as the immediate occasion of the crisis there can hardly be any doubt. In John vi. 52 the Jews bluntly put the obvious difficulty, in answer to which Jesus six times in six sentences restates His doctrine with great force; and in what goes before we see a preparation, not merely for the statement of the doctrine, but for the great rejection that will follow. The type, the promise, the doctrine are now; for the reality we must go to the Synoptics and the next Passover.

The chapter also marks an important stage in the training of the disciples. It is to them that Jesus devotes His retirement. John vi. 69 seems to be identical with Matthew xvi. 16, Mark viii. 29, Luke ix. 20. Did Peter avow his faith in Jesus' Messiahship only, or in his Godhead too? Once again the question arises as to the meaning of "Son

of God," and as to how far we are prepared to make an intelligible whole of the four Gospels, or reduce the meaning of the Synoptics to a minimum. If we believe that Andrew already knew from the Baptist that Jesus was the Messiah when he brought Peter to Him (John i. 40-42), and, on the other hand, that the Jews had already argued from Jesus calling God "His own Father" (John v. 18) that He "made Himself equal to God," we shall not stick at interpreting Matthew xvi. 16 as a confession to Jesus' Godhead. Jesus' solemn answer in St. Matthew, admittedly of the highest authenticity, and indeed the Christology of Matthew xi. 27, Luke x. 22, also make us look for more in this crowning confession. St. Mark, we must simply allow, whether we explain the fact from the nature of his authorship or no, does not make St. Peter go beyond a confession of Messiahship; the *τοῦ θεοῦ* of St. Luke must be explained from St. Matthew. Perhaps likewise the *τοῦ θεοῦ* of John vi. 69. In any case St. John's phrase would hardly imply less than St. Matthew's; in his gospel (so 1 John ii. 20) he only uses *ἅγιος* of the persons of the Blessed Trinity, and the whole phrase only throws it the more into relief. In the other Gospels it¹ is only found in the parallels Luke iv. 34, Mark i. 24, where the devils use it to show that they know who Jesus really is. It has seemed necessary to say this much of St. Peter's confession in order to present a clear view of the significance of the chapter. Few would care to deny that Jesus' claim to be Son of God was one whose full meaning His hearers only by degrees, if quickly, came to grasp; nor could He or the Jews treat the issue as distinct from that of His Messiahship (John x. 24, 30).

Peter, then, is the rock-witness to Jesus' Godhead. Later, St. John thought fit to tell the bestowal of the pro-

¹ i.e. the phrase *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*. Indeed, this is not found again in the New Testament.

mised reward (John xxi.). But straightway comes a rude trial, and He is shaken. The time is a critical one for the disciples in yet another way. Jesus begins to speak to the disciples plainly and without reserve (Mark viii. 31-2) of the death in store for Him. This prophecy becomes more definite as the time draws near, being repeated, again with promise of resurrection, Matthew xx. 17-9, Mark x. 32-4, Luke xviii. 31-4; and again Matthew xxvi. 1, 2. The first prophecy is represented in St. John by the last two verses of chapter vi.; not Peter, but Judas is devil, "for he it was that should betray Him." In the Synoptics, we may remember, Jesus proceeds in the same vein to urge upon His hearers at large the cost and the need of following Him, and then follows the Transfiguration, to strengthen His chosen three, James, the first of the apostles to behold His full glory, "the disciple who has written these things," the last, and Peter, who has confessed, and will betray, and yet prove a rock.

So much for chapter vi., which may be said to form the second part of the Gospel. Of the third, chapters vii.-xi., enough has already been said. The meeting of John xi. 47-53 seems that of Matthew xxvi. 3-5, Mark xiv. 1, 2, Luke xxii. 1, 2. We might understand the Synoptics to refer to a series, such as would in any case be natural. On the other hand, the supper at Bethany follows closely in both cases. The choice is between the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and the entry for the Passover. In any case the verbal connexion between St. John and the Synoptics does not begin again till John xii.

It is generally admitted by all critics that John xxi. is a later addition to the Gospel; not that it follows from this that it is not by St. John. This may be looked upon as the sixth part of the Gospel. There seem to be grounds for thinking that chapters xv.-xvii. were actually embodied in

the Gospel later than the rest, even though they formed part of the first publication; they may stand for the fifth part. In chapters xii.–xiv., xviii.–xx., the fourth part, St. John is running over the same ground as the Synoptics, largely supplementing them, at times in close contact with them, at times farther away. But chapters xv.–xvii. differ from them in being peculiar to himself in every way. Did St. John feel the need of some other of the Master's words, of clearer speaking touching the Holy Ghost, of the prayer for unity, a passage perhaps connecting with the similar addition of chapter xxi. ? ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα is almost the refrain of chapters xv., xvi., though it occurs once in chapter xiv. The chief merit of this view of chapters xv.–xvii. is that it explains the ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν of John xiv. 31. ἐγείρεσθε is found with ἄγωμεν in Matthew xxvi. 46, Mark xiv. 42, and here; otherwise not in the New Testament. But for chapters xv.–xvii. the words would fall practically into line in the three Gospels, being if anything rather better placed in St. John.

In conclusion, the views here advocated perhaps find some support in Eusebius, (*H.E.* iii. 24. 7–8). He records a tradition that one of St. John's objects in writing was to narrate what preceded the opening of the ministry, as the ministry stands in the Synoptics. This could hardly have referred to more than what has been called above the first part (cf. *ibid.* 12); the correspondence in John vi. is too striking to be missed. Secondly, it is apparently his own view that the Synoptics are only concerned with the events of a single year; this year, however, he seems to look upon as the last in the ministry. Perhaps he misunderstood some statement in an older writer, which really implied it was the second last.

THE IDEAL CITY AND THE REAL.

IN previous papers we have shown how very gradual was the rise of Jerusalem to pre-eminence among the shrines of Israel. Of her long and disturbed promotion, the two most rapid factors had been Isaiah's argument of the Divine purpose in her history and her vindication in 701 as the only inviolable city of the One God. But it was Josiah who rendered this rank indefeasible by realizing the ideal of Deuteronomy and concentrating the national worship in the Temple. Jeremiah, it is true, scorned the popular superstitions which assumed the unique holiness of the Temple, and never set the City of his own day in any precedence to the rest of the land, save a precedence of sin. Yet the Deuteronomic conceptions prevailed; and in looking to the future, even Jeremiah saw not only the Temple rebuilt, but the worship of the northern tribes returning to it in conformity with the Deuteronomic requirements.

For such a centralization of the worship, the religious motives, as we have seen, were high and strong. But they would hardly have achieved so full a victory without the aid of others, which were partly political, having begun with David, and partly economic, having been at work since at least the eighth century. The Monarchy implied the Capital, which replaced the tribal centres and attracted to itself more and more of the national life. To the same focus gathered the trade which Uzziah had fostered, and which must have largely increased through the long reign of Manasseh, and by his position as a vassal in the wide empire of Assyria. Thus the urban forms of society replaced the agricultural, and the capital absorbed the political talent, the military strength and the industrial efficiency of the people. But the classes which represented these were the classes whom

Nebuchadrezzar carried into captivity. It was the wisdom of this conqueror to leave to his new province her peasantry, with a few of their leaders ; but he brought away with him the royal family, the statesmen, the soldiers, the priesthood, the men of substance and the artisans, all of whom he found concentrated in the capital. Thus it came about that the bulk of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia were the men of Jerusalem, to whom their City was everything, and the rest of the land but a fringe about her walls ; while such of their fellow-captives as came from the country had lived for a generation under the spell of the religious rank conferred on her by the Deuteronomic reforms. Thus Jerusalem, at the moment of the Exile, represented not only the actual and efficient nation, but the Divine idea for which the nation lived.

These facts explain what would otherwise appear as a paradox. Jerusalem has hardly fallen, and been drained of her population, when we find her regarded in Jewish literature, not only as still alive, but as if she comprised in herself the significance of all Israel. This is the case even with Ezekiel, who was otherwise so careful to keep in sight the rest of the land up to its ideal boundaries. Not only does he call Jerusalem the *gate of the peoples*,¹ thus emphasizing the commercial power which the Jewish capital had gained through the long reign of Manasseh ; not only does he foresee her restored, as the head and heart of the people, marvellously elevated and fenced from all profane influences by his disposition of the country about her ; but to him Jerusalem is Israel. The nation's guilt in the past has been her guilt.² Their king is *the King of Jerusalem*.³ It is Jerusalem who from beginning to end of the long history has conducted those foreign intrigues in which the national

¹ xxv. 2. 1, LXX.

² Especially xvi., xxii., xxiii.

³ xvii. 12.

apostasy consists, and has been unfaithful with Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia.¹ Not Judah but Jerusalem is *Aholibah*, the adulterous wife of Jahweh.² To Ezekiel, then, the City not only is, but always has been, the People.

And as with Ezekiel, so with his contemporary, the author of the two great dirges, Lamentations ii. and iv.³ These pour their grief chiefly on the City, and similarly use his name for the whole Nation. *Daughter of Sion* is as national a designation as *daughter of Edom*.⁴ The body of Jerusalem is broken, but her spirit still lives, and is called by the poet to bewail her ruin and the death of her children ; to pray for her restoration and revenge upon her enemies. It is the same in the somewhat later dirge, Lamentations i. This breaks full upon Jerusalem, and contrasts her not with other towns, but with provinces and nations.

*How alone sits the City
That swarmed with people !
Become as a widow is she,
The chief among nations.
Once princess of provinces,
Thrall is she now.*

Judah is mentioned but twice, the City much oftener. Jacob comes in but as a third between *Sion* and *Jerusalem*.

*Sion hath spread out her hands,
None to relieve her.
Of Jacob, Jahweh commanded :
" Round him his foes ! "*
*Jerusalem hath come to be
Noisome among them.*⁵

¹ xvi., xxiii. ² xxiii.

³ EXPOSITOR for April, 1906.

⁴ Lam. iv. 22 ; cf. ii. 13. *Israel, Judah, daughter of Judah* are also used, but not so often.

⁵ Verse 17.

In all these dirges Jerusalem or Şion stands for the whole people of God ; not merely mother or mistress of the nation, but the ideal figure in whom Israel is concentrated.

Such, too, is the sense in which she is regarded by the great prophet of the Exile, the author of Isaiah xl.-lv. In one passage he describes the exiles as *naming themselves by the Holy City*.¹ He accepts the identification. He opens by addressing *Jerusalem* and *my people* as one.² He is commanded to *say unto Şion, My people art thou*.³ God, he says, *hath comforted his people, hath redeemed Jerusalem*.⁴ *Behold, I have graven thee on the palms of my hands, thy walls are continually before me*.⁵ When he addresses a promise to *Jacob-Israel*, it is *Şion-Jerusalem* who answers.⁶ This identification, we must note, does not occur in the passages on the Servant of the Lord, who is always Israel or Jacob⁷ ; but everywhere else Şion or Jerusalem is the banished Israel,⁸ the spiritual figure of God's people. This use is continued by later prophets.⁹

The same note is struck by the Psalms of the Exile. The Babylonian captivity is *the captivity of Şion*.¹⁰ *The songs of Jahweh* are the *songs of Şion*.¹¹ It is Jerusalem which the exiles cannot forget, and upon which in the most passionate of these Psalms they pour out their hearts. The metre of Psalm cxxxvii. is somewhat uncertain. The subject, as well as the form of some of the couplets, tempt us to take this, as the ordinary *Kinah* or elegiac measure, alternate

¹ xlviii. 2.

² xl. 1, 2. ³ li. 16.

⁴ lii. 9 ; cf. xlvi. 13.

⁵ xlix. 16.

⁶ xlix. 14 ; see, too, xli. 27 compared with 8 ; li. 8 compared with 1, 2.

⁷ xli. 8 ; xlv. 1, 21 ; xlv. 4 ; xlix. 3 (if, indeed, *Israel* be original to this passage).

⁸ In addition to passages quoted above, lii. 2.

⁹ Zeph. iii. 14 ; cf. Isaiah lix. 20.

¹⁰ Ps. cxxvi. 1. ¹¹ cxxxvii. 3, 4.

lines of three and two accents. But in order to produce this, one has to make some arbitrary elisions, and even then several of what should be the longer lines are too short. As the text stands it falls into lines of two accents or stresses each, except in the last line of verse 3, the first of 4, and the first of 6, in which there are three accents.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. By the rivers of Babel ¹
We sat down and wept,
Remembering Şion. | 4. How shall we sing the songs
of Jahweh
On soil that is foreign ? |
| 2. On the willows in her midst
We hanged up our harps, | 5. Jerusalem, if I forget thee,
My right hand be withered! ³ |
| 3. For there had our banishers
Asked of us songs,
Our torturers mirth :
“ Sing us of Şion’s songs ! ” ² | 6. My tongue to my mouth
cleave
If thou do not haunt me.
If I set not Jerusalem
Above my chief joy ! |

If the Fifty-first Psalm be wholly from the time of the Exile, then we see how the most spiritual of all the exilic writers was able to set the hope of the rebuilding of Şion and of the resumption of the legal sacrifices side by side with his expression of the faith that the *sacrifices of God are a broken spirit and a contrite heart*.

These, then, are the stages which we have been able to follow in the gradual exaltation of Jerusalem : her choice by David as the Capital ; the building of her Temple by Solomon ; the revelation of God’s purpose in her history by Isaiah, with the seal put upon this by her deliverance in 701 ; the concentration of the national worship upon the Temple by Josiah ; and now her captivity, effecting the release of her life from the guilt and the habits of a history which, however divinely guided, had been full of apostasy, and affording to her children the vision of her, seen through

¹ To get a second accent the Hebrew adds the emphatic there.

² Thus plural in the LXX.

³ So Grätz, by transposing the letters תִשכח *forget* to תִכח *be withered*.

the distance and the tears of exile, as the image and the name of the spiritual people of God. Hereafter, whatever may happen to her earthly frame, there will still be, free of its fluctuating fortunes, a Şion and Jerusalem—ideal and immortal. It is from such premises that future generations are to construct their doctrines of *the new Jerusalem* and *the heavenly Jerusalem*, the first sketches of which are indeed already traced by Ezekiel.

Our present duty, however, is to follow the hopes of the restoration of the earthly Şion, till at last these resulted in the return of some of her people and the rebuilding of the Temple.

When the Babylonian exiles began to form such hopes with any distinctness is uncertain. A number of predictions, probably from the period of the Exile, are found in the Book of Jeremiah, but it is impossible to give them an exact date. We must confine ourselves to those whose years we can fix with some approximation. The writers of Lamentations ii. and iv., about 570, and of Lamentations and Psalm cxxxvii., probably somewhat later, are stunned by the completeness of the City's ruin and the utterness of her fall. None of them speculate upon any recovery which may come to her either through the clemency of her destroyers,¹ or by their overthrow; for though these are described with sufficient vividness, it is felt that the matter is one between God and His people. *He has been the Foe, He has ruthlessly ruined and slaughtered.* Hence the finality of the disaster: divinely planned and foretold and divinely performed. Yet just because the worst possible has happened, the air is at last clear. Even God can have nothing left to wreak upon His people. *Their guilt is exhausted*, and His wrath must now turn on their enemies.² To so full an end did the Jews

¹ It was about 560 that Jehoiachin was kindly treated by the Babylonian king.

² Lam. i. 21, 22; iv. 22; Ps. cxxxvii. 7-9.

believe the sacred history to have run ; from so low and bare a level must it start again.

It is to this mood of the exiles that their great Evangelist addresses his gospel, weaving his verse to the same measure as that of their dirges.¹

*“ Comfort ye, comfort ye my people,”
Sayeth your God.*

*“ Speak home to the heart of Jerusalem
And call out to her,*

*That fulfilled is her servitude,
Her guilt is discharged ;*

*From the hand of the Lord she hath gotten
Double her sins.”*²

But not immediately does the prophet pass to the return and the restoration. It is his greatness (we see from the arguments which follow) to conceive of his task as first and mainly religious ; the creation of faith in God, the rousing of the nation’s conscience to their calling, the purging of their mind from all prejudice as to the ways the Divine action shall take. Therefore he first speaks to his people of God : in aspects of His majesty so sovereign and omnipotent that not only must the night of despair vanish before them, but Israel’s trust in Him shall include a willingness to believe in two new and very wonderful things : their world-wide destiny, and the selection, not of one of their own princes, but of a Gentile, to be their deliverer. Thus out of all that glory of God in nature, and in history, which the opening chapters so greatly unfold—His sway of the stars and of the nations, His tenderness to His people and His passion to redeem them—there issue gradually the two figures of the Servant and the Anointed ; the blind and plundered captive

¹ The *Kinah* or Elegiac : alternate lines of three and two beats or accents.

² Isaiah xl. 1, 2.

of Babylon, whom God yet destines to be the herald of his religion to the ends of the earth ; and the visible and accredited conqueror, whom God has raised *from the north, from the east*, anywhere out of the far and the unknown, and now—somewhere between 545 and 538—is leading upon Babylon to effect His judgement on the tyrant and to set His people free. Only when this great prologue has been achieved do there break the particular promises of the return and the rebuilding :—

*Who saith of Jerusalem, Be inhabited,
Of the Temple, Be founded !
Of the towns of Judah, Be built again,
Her ruins will I raise.*

*Who saith to the flood, Be thou dry,
And the streams will I parch.*

*Who saith of Cyrus, My friend,
My purpose he perfects.*

*Thus saith Jahweh, the God,
Of his anointed, of Cyrus ;
He, whose right hand I grasped
To bring down the nations,
To open before him the doors,
No gate shall be closed.¹*

*I, I have roused him in troth ;
His ways will I level.*

*He it is who shall build up my City,
My captives send forth.²*

The same exalted comforter, or (as some think) another,

¹ xliv. 26—xlv. 1: reconstructed by bringing the last clause of xliv. 28 to 26, and adding from the LXX. *the God* to xlv. 1 ; so Duhm, Cheyne, Marti. It is, of course, conjectural, but the result renders the measure regular. On this ground I have omitted a clause in xlv. 1.

² xlv. 13. The English phrase, in troth, but imperfectly renders בצרֶק, *in righteousness*, which does not refer to the character of Cyrus, but to that of the action of God, who means to see Cyrus through.

puts no limits to the numbers who shall return, or to the glory of the restoration. *Then thou wilt be too narrow for thine inhabitants . . . thou wilt say in thine heart, Who hath borne me these? . . . Lo, I was left solitary; these, where were they?*¹

*Arouse thee, arouse thee, put on
Thy power, O Sion;
Thy glorious apparel put on,
O City of Holiness.
Rise up, shake the dust from thee,
Captive Jerusalem!
Loosen thy shackles, O captive
Daughter of Sion.²
How beautiful are on the mountains
The feet of the herald!
Who publisheth peace and good news,
Who proclaimeth salvation,
Who sayeth to [the daughter of] Sion:
Thy God is King!
Hark, to thy sentinels calling,
All Together they shout,
As the Lord, eye to eye, they behold
Returning to Sion.
Break ye out, sing together,
Jerusalem's ruins,
For Jahweh hath pitied His people,
Delivered Jerusalem.³*

Cyrus the Great became master of Babylon and the Babylonian Empire in 539. He entered the City without fighting; welcomed and escorted (he claims) by her deity Marduk, who recognized him as his vicegerent.⁴ He speaks of

¹ xlix. 21. LXX. reads: *These of mine, where were they?*

² lii. 1, 2. ³ lii. 7-9.

⁴ The Cyrus Cylinder.

restoring to their own shrines the other Assyrian and Babylonian gods whom Nabonidus had removed to Babylon, and of giving them back their lands. But he says nothing of the Jews or of any other of the tribes captive on Babylonian soil.

At this point the compiler of the Book of Ezra takes up the story. According to him, Cyrus, soon after his capture of Babylon, gave permission to the Jews to return; and immediately, it would seem,¹ over forty thousand left Babylonia for Jerusalem, under *Sheshbazzar, prince of Judah*, who is described, too, in an Aramaic document incorporated by the compiler, as *Peḥah, or governor of a province*, and as laying the foundation of the Temple.² There is also mentioned in command of the people a *Tirshatha* (Persian *Tarsāta*), similarly *governor of a province*.³ On their arrival at Jerusalem, *in the seventh month*,⁴ the people are said to be under *Jeshu'a ben Jošadak and Zerubbabel ben She'alti'el*,⁵ who is called by his contemporary *Haggai, Peḥah, or governor, of Judah*.⁶ The returned exiles at once rebuilt the altar of the burnt-offering, resumed the morning and evening sacrifices, kept the feast of Tabernacles and thereafter all *the feasts of Jahweh*; and engaged masons and carpenters to erect the Temple, and Phœnicians to bring cedar from Lebanon.⁷ Another section from the compiler's hand⁸ states that they set to work *in the second month of the second year*; but certain *adversaries*, by whom the compiler means Samaritans, demanded a share in the work, and when *Jeshua and Zerubbabel* refused this, *the people of the land* frustrated the building, and it was postponed till the

¹ Ezra i. compared with ii. 1.

² Ezra v. 14, 16. ³ Ezra ii. 63.

⁴ We are not told the year.

⁵ Ezra iii. 2, like Ezra i. 1-8, from the compiler.

⁶ Haggai i. 14, ii. 2, 21.

⁷ Ezra iii. 3-7. ⁸ Ib. 8-13.

second year of Darius, 520, to which Haggai and Zechariah assign the beginning of new measures to build the Temple.

The Book of Ezra in its present form is so late, and the different sections are so confused, that it is not surprising that all its data have been questioned. Following Koster,¹ a number of scholars have recently asserted (1) that there was no attempt to build the Temple before 520; (2) that there was no return of exiles under Cyrus; and (3) that when the Temple was built the work was that of Jews who had never left the country. I have elsewhere so fully discussed these negative theories,² that here I need only give a summary of the argument against them.

It is true that Haggai and Zechariah do not speak of a Return, nor call the builders of the Temple Golah or B'ne ha-Golah, *Captivity* or *Sons of the Captivity*, but simply *this people*, or *remnant of the people*, or *Judah*. But we must remember that prophets so bent, as these two were, upon encouraging the poor people to use their own resources and trust in God, had little reason for appealing to the Return, or to the royal power which had decreed the rebuilding of the Temple, and all the less reason had they that the first effects of the Return were in contrast with the promises of the "Second Isaiah" so bitterly disappointing. Besides, if Haggai ignores any Return in the past, he equally ignores a Return to come, and in fact says nothing at all about the Exile itself. The argument from his silence, therefore, proves nothing. On the other hand, the testimony that a Return did take place under Cyrus cannot be wholly denied. Even if we set aside the list of the returned families as belonging to a later date, we still have the Aramaic document, which agrees with Haggai and Zechariah in assigning

¹ *Het Herstel van Israel*, 1894; German translation by Basedow, 1896.

² *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii. chap. xvi.

the real beginnings of the new Temple to the second year of Darius, under the leadership of Jeshua and Zerubbabel ; and therefore need not be disbelieved in its statement of the facts under Cyrus. Ezra, too, talks of the Golah in a way¹ which shows that he means by it not the Jews who came up from Babylon with himself, but an older community whom he found in Judah. That such had returned under Cyrus, and at once attempted the rebuilding of the Temple, is in itself extremely probable. The real effective Jerusalem, as we have seen, was the Jerusalem in Exile. It was among them that upon the advance of Cyrus the hopes of restoration had so confidently appeared, that they expressed them as if already realized. We cannot believe that none of these enthusiasts took advantage of the opportunity which there can be no doubt it was consonant to the whole policy of Cyrus to give them, but waited for nearly a century before seeking to return, and meantime left the rebuilding of the Temple to *the people of the land*, who were not only unlikely to have the energy to do the work, but would have done it in a very different spirit to that which inspires the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. "Without the leaven of the Golah, the Judaism of Palestine is in its origin incomprehensible."² And, finally, if *the people of the land* had effected by themselves the restoration of the Temple, it would not have been possible to treat them with the contempt which was shown by the exiles who returned under Ezra and Nehemiah.

These considerations appear to render the fact of a Return under Cyrus and an immediate attempt to rebuild the Temple very probable. And, indeed, some of the scholars who have called Koster's conclusions inevitable, recognize that the life of Jerusalem before the arrival of Ezra cannot be

¹ ix. 4, x. 6, 7.

² Wellhausen, *Geschichte*, p. 160.

explained except by the presence of those higher elements of the national life which had been fostered in Babylonia. They admit a return of some of the exiles before the days of Haggai.

Accordingly the probable course of events was as follows. Cyrus gave orders for the reconstruction of the Temple and despatched to Jerusalem Sheshbassar, an imperial officer, with an escort of soldiers. Some Jews must have accompanied him, both priests and laymen of a rank suitable to the high purpose before them. The Book of Ezra includes both Jeshua and Zerubbabel.¹ That a more general permission was given to the Exiles to return seems certain from the urgency of the appeals to take advantage of it, which their prophet addressed to them.² But, as we shall see, few appear to have responded. Those who did return first rebuilt the altar of the burnt offering. There is no record, and but little probability, of this having been used since the fall of the City. We saw how Jerusalem was avoided by the Jews left in the land, and Ezekiel charges them with idolatry.³ Had sacrifice been continued, the fact must have been memorable enough to have been handed down. But now the morning and evening oblations were resumed, the Feast of Tabernacles observed and afterwards the other feasts. Next Sheshbassar laid the foundation-stone of the Temple and began the building.⁴ Obstruction arose from two directions. The people left in the land had from the very beginning claimed a right to it; and now, we are told,⁵ *they weakened the hands of the people of*

¹ Prof. Sellin, on the ground of Zech. iii. 8b, vi. 12, 13, 15, argues that Zerubbabel did not reach Jerusalem till after Zechariah had begun to prophesy, but the verses quoted are inconclusive.

² Isaiah xlvi. 20, lii. 11 ff., lv.

³ Ezek. xxiii. 25.

⁴ Ezr. v. 16.

⁵ Ezek. xxxiii. 24.

Judah—these the Exiles claimed to be, in harmony with the passages quoted above—*intimidated them from building, and hired counsellors against them all the days of Cyrus, even until the reign of Darius.*¹ Thus from the very foundation of the new Temple began those intrigues with their foreign lords which faction wages against faction down to the very end of the City's history. The other source of hostility was also to prove perennial. The Samaritans, claiming to have worshipped Jahweh since the days of Esarhaddon,² asserted now or later their right to a share in the building of the Temple. If all the host of exiles, registered in Ezra ii., had been present at this time in Jerusalem, they could, with the aid of the Imperial authority, easily have overcome the opposition. That it prevailed shows how small a number had really returned. They now found themselves far from their patron and with no hold as yet upon the land they had come to. The very material they required was in the hands of their adversaries. Stone lay about them in plenty, but ordinary timber grew at a distance, and if the story be correct that even in those early days they made a contract for cedar with the Phœnicians, this had to be carried from Joppa by roads which were either in the possession of, or open to, the Samaritans.³ Apparently the authors of the imperial mandate had not foreseen such obstacles, and its officers felt that their powers were exhausted. Sheshbassar seems to have gone back to Babylon. Cyrus died in 529 and was succeeded by Cambyses, who can have had little sympathy with Jewish ambitions. Bad seasons ensued; the new colonists had to provide for their own shelter and sustenance, and their hearts, like those of many other emigrants to a promised land, grew callous to

¹ Ezra iv. 4, 5.

² ? Sargon.

³ See *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii. 219 f., for a modern analogy.

higher interests. We cannot be surprised that the Temple was neglected, or that the builders began to explain the disillusion of the Return by arguing that God's time for the restoration of His house had not yet come.¹

To such a state of mind the prophet Haggai addressed himself upon one of these political occasions, which prophecy had always been ready to use. A new king had ascended the Persian throne, Darius son of Hystaspes, and political agitations were impending. Like their Syrian neighbours, the Jews remained loyal to the throne and appear as a reward to have had a scion of their own royal house, Zerubbabel, confirmed, or now for the first time appointed, as their Peḥah or governor. To him and to Jeshua the high priest, on the first day of the sixth month of the second year of Darius—that is on the festival of a new moon, 520 B.C.—Haggai brought the word of the Lord : a command to build the Temple. It is significant that to men whose experience had fallen so far short of the former promises, this message did not repeat their glories. Like every living word of God, it struck the immediate situation, and summoned the people to the duty lying within reach of them. *Go up into the mountain*—the hill country of Judah—*and bring in timber and build the House, that I may take pleasure in it and show my glory, saith Jahweh.*² There is no talk here of Phœnician cedar, nor as yet of the desirable things of the nations miraculously poured into the City's lap. Let them do what they could for themselves ; this was the indispensable condition of the Lord showing His glory. The appeal to their conscience reached it. *God stirred the spirit of Zerubbabel, and the spirit of Jehoshua, and the spirit of all the rest of the people ; and they went and did work in the House of their God on the twenty-fourth day of the same month.*

¹ Hag. i. 2.

² i. 14.

The unflattering words of the prophet had effected a purely spiritual result. Not in vain had the people suffered disillusion under Cyrus, if now their history was to start again from sources so pure.

On the twenty-first day of the next month, when the people had worked long enough to realize the scarcity of their materials and began to murmur that the new Temple would never be like the old, Haggai came with another word, this time of encouragement and of hope. *Courage, all ye people. Get to work, for I am with you—oracle of Jahweh of Hosts and my Spirit stands in your midst! It is but a little while and I will shake heaven and earth . . . and the costly things of all nations shall come in and I will fill this House with glory. Mine is the silver and mine the gold. Greater shall the later glory of this house be than the former, saith Jahweh of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace.*¹ Two other oracles by Haggai explain to the impatient people the tardiness of the moral results of their vigour, and promise to Zerubbabel in an impending overturn of the nations the manifest recognition of his God.²

I have space only to summarize the oracles of Zechariah. (1) He began them, between the second and third oracles of Haggai, with a word that affirmed the prophet's place in the succession of the prophets of Israel³; (2) Two months later, in January or February 519, came his eight visions,⁴ of which the third showed Jerusalem rebuilt no longer as a narrow fortress but spread abroad for the multitude of her population, and the fourth Joshua vindicated from Satan his Accuser, cleansed from his foul garments and invested with the apparel of his office; (3) On the visions there follows

¹ ii. 6-9.

² ii. 10-19, 20-23.

³ i. 1-6.

⁴ i. 7-vi. 9.

an undated oracle, on the use of gifts which had arrived from Babylonia ; a crown is to be made from the silver and the gold, and, according to the present form of the text, to be placed on the head of Jeshua, but there is evidence that it was originally meant for Zerubbabel, at whose right hand the priest is to stand, and there shall be peace between them. (4) In the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius, when the Temple was approaching completion, Zechariah gave a historical explanation of how the Fasts of the Exile arose.¹ (5) And finally there are ten undated oracles summarizing all Zechariah's teaching up to the question of the cessation of the Fasts upon the completion of the Temple in 516, with promises for the future. Jerusalem shall be restored with fulness of old folk and children in her streets. Her people shall return from east and west. God's wrath towards her has changed to grace ; but her people themselves must do truth and justice, ceasing from perjury and thoughts of evil against each other. The Fasts instituted to commemorate her siege and overthrow shall be replaced by festivals ; and the Gentiles shall come to worship Jahweh in her.

These prophecies of Zechariah reveal, during the years that the Temple was building, certain processes which were characteristic of, and results which were decisive for, the whole of the subsequent history of Jerusalem. There was apparently a contest between the civil and religious heads of the community for the control of the Temple and its environs. Here before the Exile the king was paramount, and it was natural for Zerubbabel to claim to continue his authority. But the vision of the prophet decided in favour of the high priest,² and to him the crown was ultimately given that at first had been designed for the Prince.³

¹ vii.

² iii.

³ vi. 9-15.

Zerubbabel, indeed, from what cause we know not, disappears. In the last stages of the building of the Temple we do not hear of a Persian governor, but of *the elders of the Jews*.¹ In fact the exiles, with or without struggles for their national independence, settled down to that state of life which lasted in Jerusalem till the times of the Maccabees. "The exiles returned from Babylon to found not a kingdom but a church."² "Israel is no longer a kingdom but a colony":³ a colony in their own land indeed, but the heart and efficiency of the nation are still in Babylonia, where the system is being constructed under which their life for centuries shall be subject to priestly government and ideals.

Yet the civic hopes which the older prophecy had revealed for Jerusalem are not abandoned. Starting from the glowing love of Jahweh for His people the last prophecies of Zechariah not only promise a full glory to her restoration and a world about her converted to faith in her God, but the conversion of her citizens from the jealousy and fierce rivalry which beset them to justice, kindness and hearty labour bringing forth a great prosperity.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Ezra v. 3-vi. 15; cf. Guthe, *Geschichte*, p. 268.

² Kirkpatrick. ³ *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii. 189.

TARSUS.

VII. TARSUS AS AN ORIENTAL TOWN.

IT has been argued in the preceding part of this study that the early Tarsus was one of the "sons of the Ionian." This expression must be properly understood. It is not intended to mean that Ionian Greeks were the first people that formed a settlement at Tarsus. Tarsus was doubtless one of those primeval towns, like Damascus and Iconium, which have been such since settled habitations and towns began to exist in the countries. It is, indeed, highly probable that the earliest Tarsus was situated on the outer hills, about two miles north of the present town, because defensive strength was one of the prime necessities for early towns, and only on the hills could this be attained.

Nor do we mean that the early Ionian Tarsus was inhabited solely by Ionian Greeks. There was rarely, if ever, a case in which Greeks formed the sole population of a city which they founded in a foreign land. The strength and permanence of the Greek colonies were due to their power of assimilating the native population, and imparting to it something of their own genius and aspirations; but a mere settlement of unmixed aliens on a foreign shore would have been unable to maintain itself against the untempered hostility of a native population nearly as high in capacity and vigour as the aliens themselves. All analogy points to the conclusion that this Ionian colony was a mixed town, not a pure Ionian settlement.

With regard to that early time, we must content ourselves for the present with analogy and indirect argument. Until Cilicia is better known and more carefully studied, its earliest history must remain almost a blank, just as its mediæval history also is enveloped in obscurity.

The reasons from which the identity of the city Tarshish with Tarsus has been inferred seem to the present writer to be as strong as can be expected in a case of this kind ; but so long as this Ionian Tarsus-Tarshish continues to be a subject of division and controversy, it would not be right to make inferences from the identification. At any rate, it seems to be certain and admitted that the document in Genesis x. bears witness to a distinct extension of Ionian, i.e. very early Greek, influence along the Asiatic coasts in the second millennium B.C. Almost all authorities and theorists are agreed that some of the "sons of Javan" are to be found on the south coast of Asia Minor, or in the Levant islands. The following millennium shows a retrograde movement in the extent of Greek influence, and a distinct strengthening of the Asiatic power and spirit, in this region ; and this strongly affected the fortunes of Tarsus.

Such ebb and flow in the tides of influence of East on West, and West on East, has always characterized the movement of history in the borderlands, and especially along the land roads across Asia Minor, that bridge of nations stretching across from Asia to Europe, and along the sea-way of the southern coast. At one time Europe sweeps over great part of Asia, and seems on the point of overrunning the whole continent ; but always Asia recruits its forces, rolls back the tide of conquest, and retaliates by engulfing parts of Europe. If Alexander marched to the Indus and his successors ruled over Bactria and Afghanistan, the Arabs marched to the banks of the Loire and the Turks to the walls of Vienna, and all of them made only evanescent conquests. Europe cannot permanently subdue Asia, nor Asia Europe.

Thus from an Ionian colony Tarsus became an Oriental city, and in this character it is revealed to us in the oldest

historical records in which it is mentioned. The earliest reference to Tarsus occurs on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria : he captured this with other towns about the middle of the ninth century B.C., and at this time may be dated (so far as evidence or probability reaches) the first entrance of a thoroughly Asiatic race into the country west of Mount Amanus. Neither the domination of the Assyrians, nor that of the Medians afterwards,¹ nor the rule of the Persians from the sixth century onwards, was likely to cause much change in the organization of the country or the character of the cities. Those Oriental states, only loosely knit together even near the centre, exercised their power over such outlying provinces chiefly by means of a governor, who represented the king in his suzerainty over the native chiefs and townships, while the latter retained much of their old authority within their own territories.

The reinvigoration of Orientalism, or rather the weakening of the Western spirit of freedom and self-assertion in Cilicia, is marked by the growth of a native Cilician dynasty of petty kings, who ruled Cilicia under the Persian kings as overlords ; thus the Cilicians were the servants of the servant of the Great King. Kingship is the condition that seemed natural to an Oriental race, while it was alien and repellent to the ancient spirit of the European races, and spread among them only as an exotic, which gradually established itself among them through the influence of war in modifying the old national temper. So, when the last king of a Cappadocian dynasty died, the Romans offered the people their freedom. The Cappadocians, who did not

¹ No definite proof is known that the Median empire included Cilicia, but, as it extended to the Halys, it is likely to have embraced Cilicia, though that cannot be assumed as certain, for an extension of Median power across the Eastern Taurus to the Halys without touching Cilicia is quite possible.

know what freedom was, begged for a king. The Romans marvelled that any people could prefer slavery to freedom, but treated them after their own character and appointed a king to rule over them.

Accordingly in 401, when Xenophon crossed Cilicia with the Ten Thousand Greeks of the younger Cyrus's army, he found a king Syennesis, whose capital was apparently Tarsus. A Cilician king of the same name is mentioned as having co-operated with the king of Babylon in making peace between Cyaxares the Mede and Alyattes the Lydian in 585 B.C., a second about 500 B.C., and the same or a third Syennesis fought in Greece under Xerxes in 480 B.C. On the other hand, when Alexander the Great entered Cilicia in 334 B.C., there seems to have been no king of Cilicia, but only a Persian officer directly governing the country. The kings, therefore, seem to have been put down; and this in all probability was due to the growth of stricter organization in the Persian Empire, and stricter exercise of the power of the Great King in the outlying provinces through his representatives or Satraps. The action which Syennesis and his queen Epyaxa took in 401 in favour of Cyrus against king Artaxerxes may perhaps have shown the danger involved in suffering Cilicia to be governed by subordinate tributary kings, and led to the suppression of the kings and the introduction of a new system with more direct control. At any rate, it may be stated with confidence that the Persian kings inherited the system from the Assyrian (and perhaps the Median) domination, and, after permitting it to continue for fully a century and a half, put an end to it some time after 400 B.C. for the above or some other reason.

The character of the Cilician kingdom, and the constitution of Tarsus as its capital, are unknown. Nothing is recorded. The repetition of the name Syennesis has suggested to almost every modern inquirer that this name was a title,

like Pharaoh, mistaken by the Greeks for a personal name, just as Pharaoh has often been misunderstood by foreigners : though some, after consideration, reject this opinion. It seems quite probable that the old Cilician kings may have been really priest-dynasts, such as are known to have long ruled at Olba among the Cilician or Isaurian mountains, and at other places in the eastern regions of Asia Minor.¹ The priestly power naturally tended to grow greater in times of disorganization ; and the Assyrian kings may probably have found it convenient to rule through the leading priest, who was quite ready to suit himself to the foreign sovereign and buy temporal power at the price of service to a foreign sovereign. In such cases the priest's authority was always based originally on his position as representative on earth of the supreme god of the district : the priest wore the dress and bore the name of the god.² If the origin of the Cilician kingship were of this kind, it may be thought probable that Syennesis was a Divine name, rather than a title, and that the kings at their accession lost their own name and assumed the priestly name taken from that of the god, just as the priests at Pessinus assumed the name of Atis.

The coinage of this Oriental Tarsus, while showing the strong influence of the Hellenic element in the population, also reveals the weakening of that influence. The coins belong to the fifth and fourth centuries, and were evidently struck, not by a self-governing city of the Greek kind, but by kings and by Persian satraps.³ Yet even here a certain Greek character is apparent. Some of the earliest coins are more Hellenic in feeling than the latest, and occasionally there occurs a revival of Hellenic character, accompanied by

¹ The phrase *δυναστεύων* is used of one Syennesis ; and that word was appropriate to priest-kings in western Cilicia.

² Religion of Greece and Asia Minor in Hastings' *Dict.* v. p. 128.

³ We omit entirely some coins of the sixth century, which have been very doubtfully attributed to Tarsus.

the use of Greek letters on the coins ; but the latest coins of Tarsus under the Persian domination, though imitated from Greek models, were strongly Oriental in character, wholly devoid of the true Hellenic spirit, and bore purely Aramaic legends.

VIII. LEGENDS OF THE FOUNDATION OF TARSUS.

During fully five centuries therefore Tarsus was merely a town under Oriental domination. The Assyrian rule left a strong impression on the historical memory, which created various legends veiling, but not wholly concealing, the real facts of that time. Alexander Polyhistor, as quoted by Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, i. p. 27 (ed. Schoene), says that Sennacherib, king of Nineveh, was the founder. A more Hellenized form of the Assyrian legend makes Sardanapalus the founder of Tarsus, and tells how he recorded on his tomb at Anchiale, thirteen miles south-east from Tarsus, that he had built those two cities in one day. The story ran that on this tomb was a statue representing Sardanapalus snapping his fingers, with an inscription in Assyrian letters : “Sardanapalus, son of Anakyndaraxes, built Anchiale and Tarsus in one day. Eat, drink, and play, for everything else is not worth this (action of the fingers).” The poet Choirilos versified the sentiment, and Aristotle quoted it, remarking that it was more worthy to be written on the grave of an ox than on the tomb of a king. There is some difference among the ancient authorities as to whether this monument was in Anchiale or in Nineveh ; but the authority of Aristoboulos may be accepted that it was really at Anchiale. It was an easy error to transfer the monument of an Assyrian king from Anchiale to Nineveh. The opposite process could not have occurred to any one.

The form of this legend shows that it is founded partly on a historical fact, viz., the Assyrian domination, and

partly on the misunderstanding of a work of art, probably a relief, in which a male figure was represented with right hand raised in front of the face. This attitude, which appears in the reliefs at Ibriz and Iflatun-Bunar, on the north side of Taurus, was readily misinterpreted by the Greeks in later time as expressing the snapping of the fingers; and the second part of the legend expresses the sentiment by which the later people explained the gesture shown in the relief. The Assyrian letters were either cuneiform, or more probably Hittite hieroglyphics; and were certainly quite unintelligible to the Greeks when this legend took form.

Thus on a real monument at Anchiale was founded this mere legend, in itself devoid of any truth or historic value, and yet veiling real historical facts.

From such legends as these it has been quite unreasonably inferred by some scholars that Tarsus was an Assyrian foundation. Such a literal method of interpreting Greek local legend is never right; and in this case the falseness of the method is demonstrated by the fact that at their first entrance into Cilicia the Assyrians conquered Tarsus, already an important city.

Other legends current locally show that some memory of the old Ionian city was preserved in Tarsus. Athenodorus, the great Tarsian philosopher in the time of Augustus, says that its original name was Parthenia, a purely Greek name, and that it took this name from Parthenius, grandson of Anchiale, the daughter of Iapetos, i.e. Japhet. The Oriental idea that Javan, the "Ionian," was son of Japhet (Gen. x. 2) has been transformed by Greek fancy into this legend, which thus connects the two cities, Anchiale and Tarsus, with Japhet and the Ionians.

Strabo, again, says that the people whom the Greeks called Cilicians had borne at first the name of Hypachaeans,

but afterwards got the name Cilicians from Cilix, son of Agenor, king of Phœnicia. It is very common to find the changes in the history and population of a town expressed in legend as a series of changes of name. In this case the thoroughly Greek-sounding name, Hypachaeans, is an echo of the old Ionian settlement in Cilicia, and Cilix represents the Asiatic, probably Semitic, immigration and conquest.

Other legends current in the later Greek Tarsus made Perseus or Herakles the founder of Tarsus. These, perhaps, are merely Hellenized expressions of the Oriental character of Tarsus. Perseus and Herakles seem to be two names applied by the Greeks to a hero or god of the locality, whose influence in very similar forms can be traced very widely through the eastern parts of Asia Minor. Perhaps it might be discovered, if evidence had been preserved as to the course of Tarsian history, that at different periods the same Anatolian Divine figure was expressed by the Greek element in Tarsus at one time as Perseus and at another time as Herakles. This local hero was treated as a religious expression of historical relations and racial facts.

The Tarsian legends and beliefs regarding Herakles are unknown. He occurs on coins only in stereotyped Greek forms, and he is mentioned by Dion Chrysostom, speaking to the Tarsians, as "your leader," or "ancestor."¹

The legends of Perseus at Tarsus are better known; they are often represented on coins of the city, though in an obscure and as yet unexplained form, quite different from the ordinary Hellenic representations of Perseus. He appears sometimes in company with a fisherman, sometimes greeting Apollo or adoring the image of that god, which is placed on a lofty column, or carrying the image on his

¹ The word ἀρχηγός is used in the sense both of "leader in a migration" and "ancestor and founder of a race."

right hand. It is not possible to consider these in detail without illustrations to show the forms ; and the one thing that can be said with confidence about them is that they show a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental ideas. The Apollo of Tarsian cult as shown on coins is the old Apollo of the Ionians, pre-Hellenic and almost barbarous in type, holding up by the hind legs two wolves, one grasped in each hand ; and Dion Chrysostom speaks of the Tarsian Apollo with the trident, a form in which he approximates to the other Ionian god, Poseidon, with strong emphasis laid on the necessarily maritime character of the Ionian god.

There is apparent in these forms a vague suggestion of strangers, viz., an immigrant and a native people, meeting one another. This east-Anatolian Perseus has a half-Greek look, and he is found in localities such as Iconium, where no very early Greek immigrants can possibly have penetrated, The choice of name may perhaps be due, in some vague, unreasoning, and now unintelligible way, to the Persian domination.

IX. THE REVIVAL OF GREEK INFLUENCE.

In a sense this revival begins with the entrance of Alexander the Great into Tarsus in 334 B.C. We cannot doubt that this event strengthened the influence and numbers of the Greek element, which under the Persian rule was apparently in process of being slowly eradicated. Yet the revival of the Greek Tarsus was very slow. It is not even certain, though it is probable, that coins with the types of Alexander the Great were struck at Tarsus. At any rate no coins seem to have been struck by Tarsus as a city during the later fourth or the third century. Freedom and autonomy did not fall at that time to the lot of Tarsus. It was evidently regarded by the Greek kings who ruled it as an

Oriental town, unfitted for the autonomy that belonged to a Greek *polis*.

Cilicia was subject throughout the fourth century to the Greek kings of Syria of the Seleucid dynasty ; and those kings were much influenced in their policy by Oriental fashions. They administered the outlying provinces through officers who bore the Persian title of Satrap ; and they were not disposed, as their policy in general shows, to encourage everywhere within their Empire the development of Greek autonomy with the accompanying freedom of spirit and conduct. Wherever the growth of an autonomous city in the Seleucid Empire can be traced, its origin is found to lie in the needs of the central government, requiring a strong garrison city in a district which was threatened. In such cities the Seleucid kings planted new colonies of strangers to the district. The interests of these strangers lay in maintaining the Seleucid power, to which they owed their privileges and their favoured position in their new country.

It is unnecessary here to describe the way in which those Seleucid garrison cities were organized : that has been done sufficiently in the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, chapter xi. A right understanding of their character is essential to a correct appreciation of the society in the Eastern Provinces during the Roman period—the society in which the Christian churches of Asia Minor took their origin. Without a thorough study of those cities, the student of early Christian history of Asia Minor has his view inevitably distorted to a serious degree by preconceptions and prejudices, derived from the classical Greek period and other causes. Almost every city that plays an important part in the early Christian history was founded, or at least refounded and increased in population, by a Seleucid or other monarch from one or another of the various dynasties that ruled over parts of Asia Minor.

The cities are easily recognized as a rule by their names, which were almost always derived from some member of the royal family : Antiocheia, Seleuceia, Apameia, Laodiceia, appear with extraordinary frequency all over the Seleucid Empire. In some cases the new dynastic name soon fell into disuse, and the old native name revived, in the case of cities which had a great early history, and which clung to their identity with real Greek municipal pride. Tarsus was one of this class. Coins prove that for a time it bore the name of Antioch-on-the-Cydnus. But the pride of birth and past history among the Tarsians maintained the individuality and continuity of the city ; the new citizens, filled with a sense of its dignity and honour, soon made themselves a real part of the ancient city ; and the new name was quickly disused.

X. THE GREEK COLONY OF ANTIOCHEIA—TARSUS.

During the third century Cilicia lay near the centre of the Seleucid Empire, which extended far beyond it westwards to include Lycaonia, Phrygia and parts of Lydia (during part of the century down even to the Aegean coasts). In this period Cilicia was the helpless slave of the dynasty ; no danger was to be apprehended from it ; and there was no reason to make any of its towns into garrison cities. Accordingly, none of the Cilician cities struck autonomous coins during the third century : the imperial Seleucid money was the only coinage.

The peace of 189 B.C. inaugurated new conditions in Asia Minor. Lydia, Phrygia and Lycaonia were taken from the Seleucid king Antiochus the Great ; the Taurus was now made the limit of his Empire ; and Cilicia became a frontier country. It was not long till these new conditions began to produce their inevitable effect. The Cilician cities, especially those of the western half of the country, could not

but feel conscious of their growing influence. They saw that across the frontier on the north-west there was a much freer country, subject only to the mild Pergamenian rule, and barely to that, for Lycaonia was so distant from Pergamum and so difficult of access (especially when Pisidian Antioch and Apollonia were free) that the kings could not exercise real authority over it. The very sight and neighbourhood of freedom in others produces an ennobling effect; and we cannot doubt that some of the Tarsians after their long hopeless slavery began now to remember that their city had once been great, energetic, and free.

These changed conditions resulted at last in the reorganization of Tarsus as an autonomous city. Fortunately, a brief reference in 2 Maccabees iv. 30 f., 36, when taken in connexion with the rest of the evidence bearing on this subject, enables us to restore with practical certainty the date and circumstances in which the change was brought about.

This is a decisive event for the whole future history of Tarsus. Everything hereafter depends on this establishment of Tarsus on the footing of an autonomous Greek city, striking its own coinage as a self-governing state. The evidence, therefore, must be carefully scrutinized.

In the first place we notice that the new name, under which Tarsus began its autonomous career, was Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus. It was, therefore, refounded by a king named Antiochus. The coins were struck under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes,¹ and, therefore, the name must have been given either in his reign, 175-164 A.D., or in that of his father, Antiochus III. the Great, between the peace of 189 and his death in 187. It is quite improbable that the effect of the changed conditions would be realized in Cilicia and at the court of Antiochus within so short a time as two years, 189-187: moreover, if the refoundation of Tarsus as Anti-

¹ The dates of the coins are, of course, taken from the numismatic authorities, and need no discussion.

ocheia took place during those two years, it might reasonably be expected that coins struck under the founder or his son Seleucus IV., 187-175, would be known.

The possibility that Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus was founded under Seleucus IV. and named after his father, may be set aside as too remote: it is an accepted rule that cities which were named after one of the Seleucid kings must be presumed to bear the founder's name. The arguments for this are overwhelming. Clear evidence must be given for any theory of an exception to the rule; and an exception would most naturally come at the very beginning of the reign of Seleucus IV., which would leave the above arguments almost as strong as if the foundation were placed under Antiochus III.

The fair and reasonable conclusion is that the refoundation took place under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, 175-164 B.C., and that it was followed at once, and as it were ratified, by the issue of coins, which demonstrated to all the world the existence of this new city. It required about fifteen or twenty years till the effect of the changed Cilician relations to the Seleucid Empire became obvious and demanded a change in the dynastic policy.

All this is so natural, and follows so plainly from the facts and coins, that it might have been stated in a sentence as self-evident, were it not for the rigid and almost hostile scrutiny to which everything is subjected that bears, however remotely, on the books of the New Testament and on St. Paul.

In the second place we turn to 2 Maccabees iv. 30 f., 36. About 171 B.C., "they of Tarsus and Mallos made insurrection, because they were given to the king's concubine, called Antiochis.¹ Then came the king in all haste to appease

¹ There is some doubt as to the status of Antiochis. It is possible that she was legally the second wife of the king, and that the disparaging term in 2 Maccabees is due to Jewish hatred of their enemy.

matters." . . . " And when the king was come again from the places about Cilicia," etc.

It was quite a regular practice under the Persian kings (and doubtless long before the Persian Empire began) for the monarch to give to his favourites the lordship and taxes of some town or towns in his dominions. This Oriental way was followed by Antiochus IV. in regard to Tarsus and Mallos: we have already pointed out that various other Oriental customs persisted under the Seleucid kings. It is clear that those two cities were not autonomous, otherwise Antiochus could not have bestowed them on Antiochis. It is equally clear that the cities were not mere unresisting, slavish Oriental towns, resigned to live under the heel and the all-powerful will of a despot. In the third century, so far as we can judge, the word of the king had been the law in Cilicia, and the Cilician towns would necessarily have accepted their fate, which after all was not likely to be any worse under Antiochis than under Antiochus: there is no appearance that cities given in this fashion by a king were worse off than their neighbours. But now, in 171 B.C., the Greek spirit of freedom was reviving. Those two cities were precisely the two old Greek settlements in Cilicia, according to the view already stated; and that view (though still only a hypothesis, perhaps) makes the action that followed in 171 seem quite natural.¹ The Greek spirit revolted against the indignity of being handed over at the caprice of a despot. Mutiny broke out, and became so dangerous that the king had to intervene in person.

Another remarkable feature about this incident is, that there was no thought in the king's mind—on this point the very clear statement is conclusive—of military force or

¹ It would have been much harder to understand the facts if such purely Cilician and non-Greek cities as Adana and Anazarba had begun the insurrection.

compulsion to be exercised against the two cities. The king saw at once that it was a case for arrangement and diplomacy. He went "in all haste to appease matters." Arguing from the facts stated above, we must infer that the new conditions in Cilicia had already attracted his attention; and he had recognized that he had gone too far, and that he must strengthen the feeling of friendliness in Cilicia to himself and his dynasty by conceding something to the claims of the cities: we must also infer that he saw at once what form his action must take, and that he proceeded to get the consent of, and arrange terms with, the two cities.

Following the account which has been stated above as to the methods of Seleucid policy, we can therefore say with confidence that a compromise was arrived at. Tarsus was recognized as a self-governing city, but a body of new citizens, who owed their privileges to the king and were likely to be loyal to him, was added to the population. Tarsus now obtained the right to strike coins, the symbol and proof of municipal independence and autonomy; but it had to take the new name *Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus*, as a mark of its loyalty. This name, however, lasted only a few years, till the death of Antiochus.

It has a distinct bearing on this subject that Antiochus IV. Epiphanes made sweeping reforms and changes in Cilicia. *Alexandria-near-Issus* began at this time to strike autonomous coins; and *Adana*, *Aegeae*, *Hieropolis-on-the-Pyramus* and *Mopsouestia* all were permitted to strike coins with the effigy of Antiochus IV. on the obverse, but with their own types and names on the reverse—a privilege beyond what they had before possessed, though much less honourable than the purely autonomous coinage which was permitted at Tarsus and *Alexandria-near-Issus*. *Adana* was honoured with the name *Antiocheia-on-the-Sarus*, but

this more purely Oriental city did not receive such a degree of freedom and self-government as Tarsus.¹

Mopsouestia, at the crossing of the Pyramus, on the one great road leading from east to west across Cilicia, occupied a peculiarly important position, yet one in which it could never become a great city. It was not strong defensively, and yet it must inevitably be defended and attacked in every war that occurred for the mastery of Cilicia. It barred the road; but it was too weak in situation to bar it effectively. When the kings began to recognize after 189 B.C. that they must study and prepare to defend Cilicia more carefully than in the previous century, this guardian city of the road was the first to attract attention. Seleucus IV., 187–175, perceived its importance, and called it Seleuceia-on-the-Pyramus. The bestowal of this name implies a certain honour and privilege, which we cannot specify. It did not apparently carry the right of coinage, but it must beyond all question have been accompanied by strengthening of the fortifications and improvement of the roads beside the bridge and the city. In the next reign this new city was allowed to strike coins on the same footing as Adana, Aegeae, and Hieropolis; the coins at first bore the name of Seleuceia-on-the-Pyramus, but quickly the old name reappeared, and even under Antiochus IV. Epiphanes the coins began to bear the name of Mopsus.

It would illuminate this subject further, if the action of Antiochus at Mallos could be certainly determined. A city named Antiocheia was founded at Magarsus or at Mallos; but the situation of this new city, and the relation of Mallos to Magarsus, are quite uncertain; probably Magarsus was

¹ Possibly also Epiphaneia was founded or refounded by Antiochus Epiphanes; but it played no part in history till a much later period, and Epiphanes was a common epithet of the kings in this Syro-Cilician region during the following period, one of whom may have founded this city. It began to strike coins only in the Roman period under Hadrian.

simply the port-town of Mallos, and the relation between the two was as intimate, and as obscure to us, as that between Athens and Piraeus or between Notion and Colophon. Coins have been attributed to this Antiocheia-on-the-Pyramus; coins have also been attributed to Magarsus; but these are all rather uncertain. It seems highly probable that Antiocheia-on-the-Pyramus, like those on the Cydnus and the Sarus, was founded by Antiochus Epiphanes at this time as part of his scheme for pacifying and reorganizing Cilicia. It is, however, certain that Mallos was treated far less generously than Tarsus. Mallos was more remote from the frontier, and less important, than Tarsus; perhaps also the Greek element, always prone to discontent and mutiny, was too strong there¹; and Mallos sunk into insignificance during this whole period, reviving again to a small degree in numismatic history about 146 B.C. It is possible, and even probable, that Antiocheia-on-the-Pyramus was founded at Magarsus with the intention of depreciating and ruining Mallos.

This long survey of the facts has been necessary in order to prove conclusively the importance of the epoch of reorganization about 175–170. Cilicia was then recast, and its cities were reinvigorated. New life was breathed into a country, which for centuries had been plunged in Orientalism and ruled by despotism. But, of all the cities, Tarsus was treated most honourably (setting aside Alexandria as unimportant). It now stands forth as the prominent city of the whole country, with the fullest rights of self-government and coinage permitted to any town in the Seleucid Empire. The Tarsus of St. Paul dates in a very

¹ The rich coinage of Mallos, thoroughly Greek in character during the sixth and early fifth centuries, as M. Imhoof Blumer was the first to recognize it, proves how much more Greek Mallos was than Tarsus. The Greek element in those colonies had to be counterbalanced by a strong Oriental element, before it was sufficiently amenable to Seleucid requirements.

real sense from the re-foundation by Antiochus Epiphanes.

Now at last Tarsus had the status of an autonomous city, choosing its own magistrates and making its own laws, though doubtless subject in all foreign relations to the king. For its future history much depended on the new citizens and the terms of the new constitution ; and we must ask what evidence there is as to them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

A CAREFUL contribution to the study of early Christianity in its doctrinal aspect has just been made by Dr. W. Lütgert, the Halle scholar, in his monograph on *Love in the New Testament* (Leipzig, 1905). After two introductory chapters, the second of which lays stress on the influence of Hellenism in fostering such concepts as "virtue," "friendship," and "philanthropy," within pre-Christian Judaism, the author proceeds to discuss the New Testament teaching in detail. Paul and Jesus, he argues, were at one on this point. For, though the former laid exceptional stress on the mortification of one's natural affections in order to gain true love, the enemy of the latter was not for Paul, any more than for Jesus, merely hate, but that natural love which leads men to live to themselves and by themselves—the love of one's own soul and self which ruins life. To overcome this, Paul, no doubt, fell back on the death of Christ. But, Lütgert argues, even in the synoptic Gospels a similar method is assumed, for the elimination of self-love there is not only Christ's command, but His act. "Paul's conclusion, that fellowship with Jesus means fellowship with His death, and consequently the death of one's own Ego and the birth of love, amounts to the same thing as the saying of Jesus that following Him must involve the will to die,

and consequently self-denial." The main difference between the Pauline epistles and the synoptic Gospels is that the former are for the most part preoccupied with the problem of love's origin, the latter with its meaning. "The most original and simple expression of love to God is, for Paul, the desire to know Him" (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 3). "The connexion between love to God or Christ and love of Christians is never taken as self-evident. Love to the brethren does not rise naturally out of love to God and Christ. Rather, at this point, we have to do with an act of the will."

A special study in the method of "Orientalism" is given in Dieterich's *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1905, pp. 214-243) by Herr W. Köhler of Giessen, who attempts to show that Matthew xvi. 18-19 is not a genuine saying of Jesus, nor even an apostolic Jewish-Christian passage, but due to the conflict of early Christianity with the ancient world. The Jewish origin of the symbol of the keys, here and in Revelation i. 18, iii. 7-9, he thinks an unproven conjecture, principally on the ground that Judaism knew of no transference of the power of the keys from God to man; nor can he accept Sulzbach's recent Talmudic suggestion (in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft*, iv. pp. 190-192) that Kepha (= כִּיפָה) was the name given to a chamber in the temple where the keys were carefully preserved. The real solution is sought in the familiar ancient conceptions of the temple keys borne by the priest or κλειδοῦχος, the heavenly keys borne by the Sun-God, and the keys of Hades, by which the gates of the lower world could be closed or opened. Now Κρόνος in the Gnostic syncretism, for example, bears μηνύον βασιλείαν. Other deities are credited with similar powers of opening the celestial privileges to men. Consequently, Köhler supposes, the early Church formed this conception of Peter as the true κλειδοῦχος

or bearer of the keys, in opposition to the rival claimant of the pagan mysteries : Kronos, Janus, Typhon Seth, and all the rest. Even the metaphor of *binding and loosing* is attributed not to Judaism, but to Gnostic syncretism, which furnishes, e.g., in the Pistis Sophia " a substantially authentic interpretation " of the Matthew saying, the interpretation being that, by baptism, the fetters of the demons are loosed from the sinner, who thus acquires an irrevocable passport to heaven.

The rapid and aggressive movements of " Orientalism " in the entire sphere of New Testament research, i.e., of the method which seeks to uncover the roots of early Christian beliefs and conceptions in the strata of ancient civilizations round the eastern basin of the Mediterranean, have elicited two attempts at a critical estimate of the method in general, one by Dr. Carl Clemen of Bonn (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode in der Theologie*), the other by Dr. J. M. S. Baljon of Utrecht in the *Studien und Kritiken* for January (1906), pp. 50-85. Both admit the legitimacy of the method, but question its fruitfulness. Both attribute it rightly to the dislike of an atomistic view of history, fostered by the doctrine of evolution in the religious sphere, and also by the recent opening up of fresh archæological stores. But both scholars protest against the exaggerated claims put forward by Gunkel, Pfeleiderer, and others, on behalf of the new key. The Dutch critic, who goes farther than the German in his opposition, admits the presence and influence of foreign conceptions only in the eschatological sphere, as, e.g., in the Book of Revelation, though he oddly refuses to allow that the seer, in writing chapter xii., was acquainted with the mythological origin of the symbols and pictures he employed in his sketch. The Buddhistic parallels and analogies are dismissed by Dr. Baljon (pp. 61-67), who

properly allows the possibility of a certain limited amount of influence from Mithraism (pp. 68–81) on primitive Christianity. But the parallels, however striking, are usually attributed by him to coincidence. The idea of the Magi in Matthew ii. representing the submission of Mithraism to Christianity he rules out of court as an anachronism before the end of the first century, while the striking affinities between the Hermes literature of Egypt and the doctrines of the Light and Logos in the Fourth Gospel (pp. 81–82) are also set aside.

Dr. Erich Haupt's appreciative review of Clemen's life of Paul, in the same magazine (pp. 141–156), declares that the latter's discussion of the Dutch school and their rejection of all the Pauline epistles may be now taken as the last word upon the subject, which is hardly too strong commendation. The reviewer breaks a lance, however, in defence of the North Galatian hypothesis. Paul, he points out, speaks in Galatians as though he were the sole founder of the churches, which does not fit in with the fact that he had companions during his first mission tour, to whom (as e.g. to Barnabas) it would have been natural for him to allude on the question of the law. Clemen's assertion that the Syrian Antioch (Gal. ii. 11) would not have required any addition, if the letter had been written in a district where there was another Antioch, is rejected. As for Acts xvi. 6 f. (omitting δὲ after ἐλθόντες), Haupt takes κωλυθέντες very naturally as giving the reason of the following clause, i.e., explaining why, instead of labouring in Mysia they tried to enter Bithynia. If, as Haupt further points out, the missionaries were already in the province of South Galatia (xvi. 1 f.), one would naturally expect in verse 6 not a general term for the province, but a more special and narrow description of the particular district or locality. The whole paragraph

(v. 6 f.) really describes Paul hurrying through the churches he had already founded in search of a new field of operations, and this field, Haupt argues, lay in the territory, not in the province, of Galatia. As for the death of the Apostle, Haupt cannot believe it took place during the Neronian persecution. "It is far more likely, I think, that ere then the Jews had succeeded in getting rid of their hated opponent by means of the influence of Poppæa, who is known to have swayed Nero from 58 A.D. onwards."

Deissmann's views on the relation of the epistle to the letter in early Christian literature have been elaborated and re-stated by Dr. W. Soltau in volume xviii. of the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* (1906), pp. 17-29, where it is shown how the letter gradually evolved into the epistle, Cicero's correspondence reflecting the former, Seneca's the latter, stage. The author then traces the relationship between the epistle as a historical device (Acts xxiii. 26 f.) and the rise of epistolary pseudepigrapha, holding that the Catholic epistles of the New Testament all belong to the latter class, being religious tracts or short treatises thrown into epistolary form. The Pastoral epistles which, like Ephesians, are pronounced un-Pauline are dated c. 120 A.D.

A Roman Catholic study of the Epistle to the Hebrews has just appeared (*Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer*, Freiburg, 1905), in which the author, Bartholomäus Heigl, does his best to prove that language and style render the Pauline authorship possible, whilst tradition, which has the last word on such a subject (p. 58), puts it beyond question. Written to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem after the death of James, the epistle is designed to stay a threatened relapse to the older faith. A similar

thesis is advocated by J. S. F. Chamberlin (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1904), who thinks the epistle was originally addressed to Jews by a prominent Christian, possibly by Paul himself, though afterwards it was re-edited by a Christian to suit a Gentile Christian church. Professor Blau has also followed up his study of the artistic rhythm in the prose style of the epistle (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1902, pp. 420-461) by some fresh paragraphs in his monograph on *Die Rhythmen der asianischen u. römischen Kunstprosa* (1905), pp. 41-42, 78 f., 87 f., especially in view of the newly discovered fragment among the Oxyrhynchite papyri.

The inner criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and indeed of the New Testament in general, but especially of the Gospels, has received a notable contribution in Dr. E. A. Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary* (1906), which forms the fifth part of his *Diatessarica* and a sequel to his *Johannine Grammar* of last year. There is perhaps less for the expositor and preacher here than in the preceding volume, but more for the exegete and student. The examination of the language and conceptions, conducted with a subtlety of insight and thoroughness of investigation which are beyond all praise, rests on the principle that "the LXX., the Synoptists, the New Testament as a whole, Epictetus, and the Papyri of 50-150 A.D." are "safer guides than writers of the third century and far safer than those of the fourth" to an elucidation of the Johannine thought. The writer of the Gospel is, to Dr. Abbott, "a master of style and phrase, as well as an inspired prophet," and "an honest man (a fact that some commentators hardly seem to recognize), writing indeed some seventy years or more after the Crucifixion, but still with some knowledge of what he wrote about, and with some sense of responsibility to those for whom he wrote" (pp. x.-xi.). One can only chronicle one or two

of Dr. Abbott's findings. The words *πρῶτός μου* ("He was before me") in i. 15 and i. 30 (cf. xv. 18) are held to mean "My First" (§§ 1896 f., 2665 f.), i.e., "The First-born of God, the object of my worship" (cf. Rev. i. 17, xxii. 13). In support of the interpretation of *ἀνωθεν* as "from above" in iii. 3-7, the author observes that "Nicodemus was familiar with the doctrine of 'new birth,' applied to baptized proselytes, and he knew that very often it did not mean much." Hence, in view of Christ's remark in Matthew xxiii. 15, "that a proselyte—who was compared by the Jews to a new-born child—might be made a *child of hell*," it was "necessary to emphasize the truth that regeneration must be *from above*" (§ 1908). On xv. 16 Dr. Abbott has this fine comment: "'Fruit,' as always in John, means the vintage and harvest of souls, which elsewhere the Apostles are said to 'reap.'" Why, then, does the sentence not end with *that your fruit may abide*, instead of proceeding to add: *that whatsoever ye ask the Father in My Name He may give you?* Because, the writer suggests, after a grammatical discussion of *ἵνα*, the clause "reminds the Apostles that the more they succeed, the more they must remember that their success depends on God's answer to their prayers, and—since divine answer to human prayer depends on human unity with divine will—on the oneness of their will with His" (§ 2122). In passages like vi. 20, the words *I am* are also interpreted as meaning not "I am myself, Jesus," but in the deeper sense, suggested by the LXX. translation *ἐγὼ εἶμι* of the Hebraic phrase, of "I am the Saviour" (§§ 2220 f.). Finally, in the section on "Twofold Meanings and Events," it is pointed out that "To Andrew and Andrew's nameless companion the Lord says, *What seek ye?* After the life of the Incarnate Son is closed on earth, and when the disciples have gained through sorrow and tears new insight into what that life has been, the voice of the

risen Saviour utters, as its first words to Mary, 'Why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?' There are passages in the Old Testament and Philo that indicate how this question might be traditionally regarded as one of mystical meaning."

Of less importance is a fresh attempt, made along the lines followed by Wuttig and Küppers, to solve the Johanne problem by relegating the Fourth Gospel to the seventh decade of the first century. Herr H. Gebhardt (*Die Abfassungszeit des Joh.-evangeliums*, 1906), the author of this essay, regards the Gospel, or rather chapters i.-xx., as composed by John the apostle in Ephesus during 64-66 A.D., in order to confirm Gentile Christians in their belief. The historical element is referred not to any acquaintance with the synoptic Gospels, but to independent oral traditions possessed by the writer. The last chapter (xxi.) was written slightly later by Andrew and Philip—as Haussleiter had already suggested.

JAMES MOFFATT.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

WILKE'S *Jesaja und Assur* (Leipzig, 1905) is an elaborate study of Isaiah's policy during the Assyrian campaigns. In a number of passages the prophet is neutral, if not friendly disposed to Assyria, whereas in another series his standpoint is changed and he hurls his prophecies against one whom he formerly regarded as Yahweh's instrument. How to explain Isaiah's attitudes is the problem which Wilke proceeds to handle. In his discussion of the political history of the period he works on independent lines. The evidence of the Assyrian inscriptions cannot be taken implicitly without criticism; ancient Oriental policy (as Winckler

has conclusively shown) is a factor which requires very careful consideration ; and the literary problems of the book of Isaiah demand a more sympathetic and less drastic treatment than is sometimes accorded them. The hypothesis that Sennacherib invaded Judah a second time (after 701 B.C.) is summarily dismissed ; the famous question of Azriyau of Yaudi is settled in favour of the old identification with Azariah of Judah, and the more controversial problem of Mušri-Mišraim is held to be satisfied by the assumption that the term covered not merely the Nile Valley alone, but also South Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula. (W. compares the "Welschland" of German antiquity.) Throughout the Syro-Ephraimite struggles (Isa. viii. 5-8, xvii. 1-11, viii. 1-4, vii. 1-9, 10-16) and the hopes raised by the death of Tiglath-Pileser (v. 26-30, vii. 18-20, xiv. 29-32), till shortly before 722 (xxviii. 1-4) ; further, in the time of Ashdod's revolt (xx.), and scarcely a year later when Merodach-Baladan sent his embassy (xxxix., W. argues in favour of 711-710 for the event), and finally, in the months immediately before and after 705 (xxviii. 7-22, xxx. 1-17, xxxi. 1-4, xxix. 1-4, 6, 15), Isaiah's standpoint towards Assyria is found to be the same. Between 705 and 701 the prophet departed from his pro-Assyrian policy and his new views are preserved in passages belonging to the time when Judah and Jerusalem were threatened (x. 28-34, ix. 1-6, xviii., xxxvii. 33-35, 30-32, x. 5-19, 24-27, xxxiii., xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, xxxi. 5-9). Then comes the climax (xxx. 27-33) and the deliverance of Jerusalem (xxxvii. 22-29). In a review of the several causes which could explain Isaiah's change, Wilke discusses the hopes which were kindled in Judah by the fall of Samaria and at the accession of Hezekiah, and shows how any aspirations Judah may have had for a new Davidic kingdom were doomed to be shattered by the Assyrian policy of forming a *Weltreich*.

Ed. Meyer (*Sitzungsberichte d. kön. preuss. Akad.*, Berlin, 1905, pp. 64 et sqq.), in a lengthy article on Moses and the Levites, examines in detail the stories which have gathered around the great lawgiver and makes a number of radical suggestions of importance. He argues that mythological elements which were easily attached to the birth of great heroes have been re-shaped and put into a semi-historical form in the case of Moses. The closely related legend of the birth of Sargon of Agade is well known, and numerous more or less close parallels have been collected by A. Jeremias, *Alte Testament*, pp. 255 sqq., *Babylonisches im neuen Testament*, p. 30 seq. According to Meyer, the account of the theophany at Sinai originated in a story of some volcano in the ancient Midian—there are said to be many extinct volcanoes in the district extending as far as Mecca—and, in agreement with this, Yahweh was originally regarded as a god of fire. The historical Moses was the head of the Levites (his association with Egypt being of secondary origin), and the “contention,” the scene of which was Massah and Meribah, was one between Yahweh and Moses, a parallel to the story of Jacob’s wrestling. At Kadesh, the Levites had their central sanctuary with a complete legal code, and it is suggested that they entered Israel and Judah in the monarchy, probably in the time of Omri’s dynasty, after the fall of which they began to attain eminence. In the course of his discussion Meyer has some remarks upon the nature of Egyptian prophecies of the future, a subject which he insists is important for the study of Hebrew prophecy. In connexion with this, it may be noticed that Professor Breasted, in his admirable *History of Egypt* (p. 205), has recently called attention to a “Messianic” oracle in early Egyptian literature, other specimens of which may be traced down to the early Christian centuries. To this he remarks: “We cannot resist the conclusion that [this class of literature] furnished

the Hebrew prophets with the form and to a surprising extent also with the content of Messianic prophecy. It remained for the Hebrew to give this old form a higher ethical and religious significance." Apropos of the same topic, reference may be made also to an interesting article by Wilcken in *Hermes* (1905, pp. 544 sqq.) on "Egyptian prophecy" with some suggestive remarks on its relationship to Hebrew prophecy.

Spiegelberg, *Orientalistische Zeitung*, February, 1906, suggests that the name Phicol (Gen. xxi. 22) is of Egyptian origin and means "the man of Kharu" (Syria and Palestine), an interesting counterpart to Phinehas "the negro." On the assumption that the native name Kharu was preserved until a comparatively late date, he conjectures that it reappears in the form *κοίλη* in Coele-Syria. There is no obvious explanation of the term "hollow" Syria. It was once applied to the whole of the Syrian coast from Orontes to Ashkelon and to the inlying districts including Thapsacus, and, on his theory, *ἡ Συρία ἡ κοίλη* (Syria: Kharu) was originally used in contrast to *ἡ Συρία ἡ Παλαιστίνη*.

In a study of Zechariah i.-viii., Van der Flier (*Theolog. St. u. Krit.*, 1906, pp. 30 sqq.) discusses the structure of the Visions and endeavours to distinguish those fragments which, though by Zechariah himself, appear to belong to another context. In chapter iv., vv. 6b-10a are a later insertion and seem to be part of a larger prophecy. Chapter vi. 9-15 is also separated from the Visions, and with it goes chapter iii. where Joshua's authority is not yet recognized (chap. vi. 12), thus pointing to a date previous to 520 B.C. Among other passages whose background differs from that of the Visions he includes chapter ii. 10-17 (R.V., vv. 6-13).

STANLEY A. COOK.

*THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE MURATORIAN
CANON.*

THE Muratorian Canon is our oldest list of the books of the New Testament. It is a fragment discovered in the Ambrosian library at Milan, and published in 1740 by the librarian Muratori, from whom it takes its name. His object was to give an example of the kind of Latin an ignorant monk could write, but it was soon seen that the document had a very great intrinsic importance, due to the professed antiquity of the Canon of New Testament writings which it contains. Pius, who was bishop of Rome from 146-161 A.D., is mentioned as being almost a contemporary of the author. As it stands, the fragment is anonymous; and, of course, several attempts have been made to identify the author. Muratori himself suggested "Gaius the Presbyter," of whom Eusebius says: "There has come down also to our time a dialogue by the eloquent Gaius, which was addressed at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, to Proclus, the champion of the Phrygian heresy. He, Gaius, rebukes the precipitancy and rashness of the opposite party in the matter of composing new scriptures, and mentions only the thirteen epistles as belonging to the blessed Apostle, not including the Epistle to the Hebrews with the rest; so also, even to the present day, there are some in Rome who do not regard it as being the Apostle's."

This was, for a time, practically the sum of our knowledge and the limit of critical speculation concerning Gaius. Then came the discovery of a work entitled, *The Philosophu-*

mena, a Refutation of all Heresies. This was attributed to Origen by the first editor on its publication in 1851, and subsequently, by certain critics, to the Gaius in question, together with a number of other works belonging to the second century.

It is, however, perfectly certain that this document is the work not of Gaius, but of Hippolytus. And Lightfoot took the various lesser books which had been ascribed to Gaius, and showed that they also were to be regarded as writings of Hippolytus (*Apost. Fath.*, part i. vol. ii. pp. 378–380). He was, however, unable thus to explain away the Dialogue with Proclus, except by supposing that Proclus and Gaius alike were mere *dramatis personæ*, with no more solid basis for existence than Hippolytus' imagination. Some later authors, finding a book *Gaius against Proclus*, had, he assumed, deduced from it Gaius' reality.

Now if Gaius was a mere lay figure, Muratori's connexion between Gaius and the fragmentary Canon disappears, unless we reserve the case that the fragment is a part of the speech of the assumed Gaius against the imaginary Proclus. And, as all Gaius' other works had been attributed to Hippolytus, it was natural that this should go the way of the rest. The question then arose, to which of the Hippolytean writings did it belong? It is certainly not in any of his extant works, but we have several lists of his writings preserved, and from the titles it may be possible to infer to which of them a Canon of the books of the New Testament should be referred. The oldest of these lists is an inscription on the statue of Hippolytus, which is now preserved in the Lateran Museum. The statue dates from the first half of the third century, and represents the recently deceased Hippolytus as seated in his episcopal cathedra. On the back of his chair there is a list of his works, and Lightfoot quotes the inscription in full. This gives very nearly a complete

catalogue; though it omits several books to which other writers refer. Eusebius' catalogue (*H.E.* vi. 22) does not profess to be complete, nor does it throw any fresh light. That of the fourteenth century Syrian father, Ebed-Jesu, does, however, include a title which we should not have known from other sources, for it mentions two works noted on the chair—*ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως*, and just before them inserts, “And chapters against Gaius.” Lightfoot guessed—and, as we shall try to show, the guess was a correct one,—that there was some intimate connexion between this work and the two apologetic treatises, suspecting that it was composed of extracts taken from them.

To return to the Canon itself. Lightfoot not unnaturally attempted to discover the original Greek that lay behind Muratori's text, and his first effort showed that some of the Latin went naturally into Greek Iambics, and it was possible to retranslate the whole into verse. It is true that there were certain metrical licences, but, as Lightfoot pointed out, they were frequently surpassed by writers of the same age. Now near the end of one of the lists of Hippolytus' works was an item entitled *ῥῥδαὶ εἰς πάσας τὰς γραφάς*. This was suspected to be a metrical account of the books of the Old and the New Testaments, The first part of this was assumed to have perished, but possibly the second survives in a mutilated form in the Muratorian Canon.

This, then, is a brief outline of the position in which Lightfoot left the study of this fragment. The next phase began with the discovery of a MS. of a commentary on the Apocalypse by Dionysius Bar Ṣalibi, a Syrian father of the twelfth century. The MS. is in the British Museum (Add. 7185), and was there studied by Dr. Gwynn of Dublin.

Dr. Gwynn published the results of his investigations in *Hermathena* (vol. vi. pp. 397-418). He found in the MS.

in question five passages where Bar Ṣalibi quotes from a work of Hippolytus against Gaius. The quotations are introduced with a brief objection by the "heretic" Gaius, who insists in each case that the teaching of the Apocalypse is not in accord with the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. The answer of Hippolytus is given in a condensed form—as, indeed, are nearly all Bar Ṣalibi's quotations from other authors. From these passages Dr. Gwynn deduces three direct and certain conclusions.

1. They establish the separate existence of Gaius, thus refuting the view of his identity with Hippolytus which Lightfoot had put forward.

2. Gaius rejected the Apocalypse on the ground stated above.

3. Hippolytus wrote a work in refutation of this view. This, Dr. Gwynn thinks, is not the same as the *Apology for the Apocalypse and the Gospel*. (But Dr. Gwynn translates the Syriac words "mappaq b'erucha" as "Exposition," although the usual rendering is that of Lightfoot, "Apology.")

To these he adds, as a safe inference, that the Muratorian Canon was not the work of Gaius, since the Canon includes the Apocalypse, while Gaius rejected it. It also seemed equally certain to Dr. Gwynn that Gaius accepted the Fourth Gospel. This is due to the fact that Hippolytus quoted it against him, and was unlikely to appeal to a disputed book. Further, one of the passages quoted proves that Epiphanius knew and used the same work that Bar Ṣalibi employed in this Commentary. This work Dr. Gwynn believed to be the lost "Refutation of the thirty-two heresies," which is now identified with the *Philosophumena*.

The next step was taken by Rendel Harris, in a paper read before the Society for Historical Theology in November, 1895. Dr. Harris has since published this essay (*Presbyter*

Gaius and the Fourth Gospel) in a small volume, entitled *Hermas in Arcadia*. Working on the same material as Dr. Gwynn, the Cambridge scholar found himself able to go further in his knowledge of Gaius, and succeeded in explaining one of the difficulties which hindered our acceptance of the view that Gaius attributed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. He was also able to show, from Bar Şalibi's commentary on the Fourth Gospel, that Gaius had denied the Johannine authorship of that book in just the same way as he criticised the Apocalypse. Dr. Harris goes on to suggest, by a reference to the passage in Epiphanius already cited by Gwynn, that Gaius was one, perhaps the leader, of the heretics known as the Alogi. It is strange to find that Harnack (*Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, p. 227) still refuses to admit that Gaius rejected the Gospel of John, on the ground that Eusebius could not have described him as being ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ (*H.E.* ii. 25). This is certainly a difficulty; but in the face of the overwhelming evidence which we now have to the contrary, we can no longer agree with Gwynn and Harnack on this point.

Dr. Gwynn (*Hermathena*, vi. p. 410) notes with regret that there are two leaves missing from the MS. of Bar Şalibi on the Apocalypse in the British Museum. Fortunately a MS. of this work has been discovered in the Ṭûr 'Abdîn, and a transcript has found its way into the collection of Rendel Harris. This MS. is complete, and by one of those strange tricks of fortune which are at once the hope and the despair of the critic, the missing pages contain the solutions of some of the problems which centre round Gaius, Hippolytus and the Muratorian Canon.

The keys that have been already filed will go far towards opening the door; but it is only within the last few months that the exact piece of metal has been found which will fit the lock without further manipulation. This is true, at any

rate, as far as the authorship of the Muratorian Canon is concerned ; and there are one or two other problems whose answer is given with certainty.

Bar Şalibi is a good scholar and a sound critic, and well repays study. The introduction¹ to the Commentary on the Apocalypse is so interesting that it will be well worth quoting at some length :—

. . . “ Now that we have finished the exposition of the Gospel, brethren, fully and very clearly, we come and approach the exposition of the Revelation of John the Evangelist. But do you, readers, with the students of the spiritual enquiries maintain your prayers for Dionysius the stranger, according as you also will be saved. At the beginning of the treatise we must say that there are many teachers who are in doubt regarding the Revelation of John, and say that it is not his. And Eusebius of Caesarea declares the same thing in his ecclesiastical writings (i.e. in the History of the Church). For Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, says that the Revelation was not that of John the Apostle, but of another John, ‘ the Presbyter,’ who lived in Asia. The reason is, that the style of the Revelation is not like the type of the language of the Gospel. Also John makes no mention of his name at all in the Gospel, but does put his name at the beginning and end of the Revelation. Now we agree that he received the Revelation of which he wrote from our Lord. Irenaeus the bishop, and Hippolytus of Bozra say that the Revelation is that of John the Evangelist, and that it was granted about the end of the reign of Domitian. And Eusebius of Caesarea agrees with this, but immediately says that some do not accept it as being the Revelation of John the Apostle,² so saying that

¹ An edition of this work is in course of preparation, under the direction of Dr. Rendel Harris.

² Here the British Museum MS. breaks off. The first page is very defective, and even where whole, difficult to decipher.

it is the work of John the Elder, who was a contemporary of John the Apostle. And there are two tombs in Asia, one being that of the Evangelist, the other that of John the Elder.

Hippolytus of Rome states that a man named Gaius had appeared, who said that neither the Gospel nor yet the Revelation was John's; but that they were the work of Cerinthus the heretic. And the blessed Hippolytus opposed this Gaius, and showed that the teaching of John in the Gospel and Revelation was different from that of Cerinthus. "This Cerinthus was one who taught circumcision, and was angry with Paul when he did not circumcise Titus, and the Apostle calls him and his disciples in one of his letters¹ 'sham apostles, crafty workers.' Again he teaches that the world was created by angels, and that our Lord was not born of a virgin. He also teaches carnal eating and drinking,² and many other blasphemies. The Gospel and Revelation of John, however, are like the teaching which the Scriptures contain; and so they are liars who say that the Revelation is not by the Apostle John." And we agree with Hippolytus that the Revelation is the Evangelist John's. This is attested by S. Cyril and Mar Severus, and all the teachers who bring evidence from it. Also the Theologian,³ in his 'Address to the Nation,' testifies that there is no proof from the conclusion,⁴ and says, 'as John taught me by his Revelation; He made a way for thy people, and these stones'—where he calls the heretics and their teaching stones."

This is good criticism, and we shall want it again. In the meantime, Bar Şalibi plunges at once into exposition:—

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 13. *ψευδαπόστολοι, δόλιοι έργάται.*

² i.e. in the millennium.

³ i.e. Gregory Naz. ?

⁴ i.e. the mention of John's name in Rev. xxii. does not disprove his identity with the fourth Evangelist.

“*The Revelation of Jesus Christ, etc.*—Hence he begins with that which was revealed to him in a vision concerning those things which were about to be.

To His servant John.—He records his name in the Revelation that we may believe what he saw. In the Gospel he does not record his name, because there was no need for it there, since all the Apostles were witnesses of what our Lord did.

John to the seven Churches which are in Asia.—By Churches, he indicates cities, and calls them Churches because of the excellence of the elect who were in them. He says “seven,” because the number seven was in high esteem among the Hebrews in the Scriptures. And there are seven gifts of One Spirit descending on one Church. Hippolytus says that in writing to seven Churches, he writes just as Paul wrote thirteen letters, but wrote them to seven Churches. That to the Hebrews he does not judge to be Paul’s, but perhaps Clement’s.”

We have gone far enough. We have heard something like this before. “Cum ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus sequens prodecessoris sui Johannis ordinem nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali:—ad Corinthios prima, ad Ephesios secunda, ad Philippenses tertia, ad Colossenses quarta, ad Galatos quinta, ad Thessalonicenses sexta, ad Romanos septima. Verum Corintheis et Thessalonicensibus licet pro correptione iteretur, una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse denoscitur, et Johannis enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit.” So runs the fragment of Muratori. What are we to say?

Muratori’s own guess as to the Gaian authorship of this fragment is at any rate proved to be impossible by the above quotation from Bar Şalibi. For the Canon accepts both the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel as being

Johannine ; Gaius accepted neither. But the mention of Pius seems to prove that the Canon is at least of the age of Hippolytus and Gaius. The probabilities were, before, on the side of the Hippolytean authorship ; it looks as though they were considerably strengthened. It is obvious, however, that Bar Şalibi is not quoting exactly, and, unfortunately, we have no means of testing his other quotations from Hippolytus, unless Epiphanius be allowed to represent Hippolytus more closely. But we can compare his references to Eusebius with that author's Syriac text, and the result we reach is the certainty that Bar Şalibi's quotations are not necessarily verbal. He only means to reproduce the thought. This being so, we shall have no longer any hesitation in saying that our Syrian Father is quoting the Muratorian Canon as being the work of Hippolytus. The proof is not mathematical, but there seems to be no real objection on *a priori* grounds ; so that there is now as strong a presumption as criticism ever needs, and a much stronger one than it usually finds. If the scale pans wavered at all before, this extra weight will carry them down with a run.

But we now have a further light on the Canon itself. The omission of the Epistle to the Hebrews has puzzled every one, Westcott included. The Canon, however, is universally admitted to be incomplete, and its testimony to the fourteenth "Pauline" epistle would have been most valuable. We have no other indication of Hippolytus' views on the authorship beyond the bare fact that he did not regard it as Paul's. Origen and Eusebius both report that some people have regarded it as being the work of Clement of Rome. Now for the first time we have a name attached to that suggestion, and while we feel that the Clementine authorship is out of the question, it is interesting to note that it had such respectable support as that of Hippolytus in his Canon.

So we come to a further question. What is the work of which this document forms a part? Lightfoot, finding that he was able to write it in Greek verse, suggested the "Odes on all the Scriptures." And this indeed seems at first sight a very suitable place for the Canon. But a scholar of Lightfoot's calibre would probably have little difficulty in rendering any Latin into Greek Iambics, and even if it were originally metrical, it need not have formed a part of the Odes. And we shall find reason to assign it differently.

In the first place we have to notice that this is not a mere guess on Bar Şalibi's part. He knows what he is quoting and he knows its source. It follows from his familiarity with the author that he is familiar with the work containing the passage. Now, so far, we have only detected one single work of Hippolytus on Bar Şalibi's bookshelf. This is the work against Gaius which Dr. Gwynn has referred to the *Refutation of the thirty-two Heresies*, and Lightfoot to the *Apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*. The recognition of the *Refutation* under its pseudonym of *Philosophumena* contradicts the theory of the Irish critic. He was unable to accept Lightfoot's identification of the "chapters against Gaius" with the *Apology*, because he believed that Gaius accepted the Fourth Gospel, and Hippolytus was evidently opposing some one who rejected it. The passage cited from Bar Şalibi proves conclusively that Gaius did not regard John as the author of the Fourth Gospel. He is in the critical position of the "Alogi," and we feel ourselves justified in regarding him as their leader and the principal object of Hippolytus' attack. It is still difficult to explain Eusebius' respect for Gaius, and we do not quite understand how Hippolytus could quote against him from the Fourth Gospel. But we feel that although these objections would have weight in the absence of other evidence, they cannot be allowed to

stand in face of the direct and positive testimony of Bar Şalibi.

The removal of this objection leaves open the way for the other hypothesis—that there is an essential connexion between the “chapters against Gaius” and the *Apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*. It may be noted that it is not at all improbable that this was what Ebed Jesu intended to imply in his catalogue of Hippolytus’ works. A very brief acquaintance with the ways of Syriac scribes justifies us in omitting a conjunction, or at least in suspecting its presence. And in all probability Ebed Jesu intended to write first the full title of the work and then denote two of its sections, one concerned with the Apocalypse, the other with the Fourth Gospel. This view is strongly supported by the way in which the combatants are introduced by Bar Şalibi. “The blessed Hippolytus,” he says, “opposed this Gaius”—*gam luqbal hana Gaius*—a phrase so like the title of Hippolytus’ work “*rishē luqbal Gaius*” as to justify us in regarding it as a reminiscence thereof. Lightfoot may have felt that Bar Şalibi had robbed him of a favourite theory by proving the existence of Gaius; he has now every reason for gratitude, for on two points, the authorship of the Muratorian Canon and the identity of the “chapters against Gaius,” the Syrian Father has unexpectedly vindicated two out of the English critic’s series of conjectures.

Now, this being the only work of Hippolytus which we have found in Bar Şalibi’s hands, the law of parsimony of causes compels us to attribute all quotations from this author to the same document unless we have some fairly strong evidence to the contrary. And an examination of the evidence seems to lead to a conclusion which confirms our first impression. We are now at liberty to use the Canon itself in order to determine its place in Hippoly-

tus' writings. And near the beginning we certainly find a most illuminating passage: "Primum omnium Corinthiis schisma haeresis interdicens, deinceps Galatis circumcisionem, Romanis autem ordinem scripturarum, sed et principium earum esse Christum intimans, prolixius scripsit. De quibus singulis necesse est a nobis disputari." So little has this passage been understood that some editors have even inserted "non" before "necesse." Needless to say, this has no foundation in the MS. and it leaves the passage really more inexplicable than ever. For why should these three epistles be especially mentioned if there is no need to discuss them? The very fact of their selection here shows, as Tregelles saw, that this Canon must have stood at the head of a controversial work. The points of difference will be:—

1. Heresy.
2. Circumcision.
3. Canonicity of certain books of Scripture.
4. Christology.

The word "ordinem" offers a difficulty. Its use in the first passage cited—a list of the Pauline Epistles—shows that it does not mean a definite orderly sequence. And it seems to have been the earliest translation of the idea expressed in the Greek ecclesiastical language by *κάνων*, "Canon," as a Latin word is not quoted in this sense before Augustine, while Quintilian (1, 4, 3) uses "ordo" with almost the same meaning: "Grammatici alios auctores in ordinem redigerunt, alios omnino exemerant numero." We recognize, therefore, that it is not simply the order of the books of the Scriptures, but a list of those which they contain. Moreover, there would be little point in discussing the sequence of the books of Scripture in a treatise which involved the other matters; and as a matter of fact the sequence is immediately set at nought.

Hippolytus' meaning in this extract is clear. He points out how Paul had found it necessary to face and solve certain problems in certain of his Epistles. He remarks that he is faced with the same questions, and will have to discuss these same matters. The connexion in subject between this passage and Bar Şalibi's quotation from Hippolytus is abundantly clear.

This *Cerinthus* was one who taught *circumcision*, and was angry with Paul because he did not circumcise Titus, and the Apostle calls him and his disciples in one of his letters "Sham apostles." . . . Again he teaches that the world was created by angels and *that our Lord was not born of a virgin*. He also teaches carnal eating and drinking and many other blasphemies."

Primum omnium Corinthiis *schisma haeresis* interdicens, deinceps Galatis *circumcisionem*; Romanis autem *ordinem scripturarum* sed et *principium earum esse Christum* intimans prolixius scripsit. De quibus singulis necesse est a nobis disputari.

The parallel between the various subjects is easily seen when it is remembered that Bar Şalibi does not mean to quote exactly. The question then arises, To which of Hippolytus' works is the passage to be referred? The natural answer is, *The Philosophumena*; but we have that work, and the passages concerned with Cerinthus make no mention of his Judaizing tendency. The *Chapters against Gaius*, however, must have contained sections on all the questions raised in the above citation from the Canon, because they are the points on which Cerinthus differs from the Scriptures. It is by enumerating and discussing such points, as Bar Şalibi tells us, that Hippolytus refutes Gaius' objection to the Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel. It becomes clear, therefore, that the most suitable suggestion for the source of this Canon is the book entitled *Chapters against Gaius*.

One more point may be brought forward. Can we be sure that this Cerinthus passage in Hippolytus comes from the same work as the other answers to Gaius? If it does, we may be fairly sure that our guess is right, and we have reached a point between probability and certainty. For this it is only necessary to turn to that arch-plagiarist, Epiphanius. Dr. Gwynn and Rendel Harris have already shown that he knew and quoted the "Heads against Gaius," and indeed, that his work is largely based on Hippolytus. We come to him with assurance, and find our expectations fully met, in the article on Cerinthus in Epiphanius' work on Heresies. The following extracts will make this sufficiently clear:—

BAR SALIBI.

"The world was created by angels, and our Lord was not born of a virgin."

"This Cerinthus was one who taught circumcision, and was angry with Paul because he did not circumcise Titus."

EPIPHANIUS.

Patr. Gr., vol. 41, col. 377.
ἐξηγεῖται καὶ οὗτος ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσήφ τὸν Χριστὸν γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὁμοίως ἑπὶ ἀγγέλων γεγενῆσθαι.

Col. 381.

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν τότε ἐπραγματεύθη κινήθηνα ὑπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ψευδαποστόλου Κηρίνθου ὃς καὶ ἄλλοτε στάσιν αὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰργάσαντο ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὁπνῆκα Παῦλος ἀνῆλθε μετὰ Τίτου, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔφη, ὅτι ἀνδρας ἀκροβύστους εἰσήμεγκε μεθ' ἐαυτοῦ, ἥδη περὶ τούτου λέγων, κεκοίμηκε, φησί, τὸν ἅγιον τόπον. διὸ καὶ Παῦλος λέγει· Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος κ.τ.λ.
(there follows a quotation taken from Gal. ii. 3-5).

Finally, a decisive passage:—

"The Apostle calls him and his disciples, 'Sham apostles, crafty workers.'"

Col. 384.

καὶ οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ εἰρημένοι ψευδαπόστολοι, ἐργάται δόλιοι μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ.

¹ Referring to Carpocrates, the last heretic with whom Epiphanius has dealt.

This does not claim to be more than a preliminary discussion of the subject. A fuller investigation of the questions involved is reserved for the publication of Bar Şalibi's Commentary on the Apocalypse. It may be possible, however, to sum up our results. We may regard as practically certain the following :—

1. The fact that the Muratorian Canon is the work of Hippolytus.

2. The identity of the *Chapters against Gaius* with the *Apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*. Incidentally we may regard it as proved that Gaius really existed.

3. The free use made by Epiphanius of the *Heads against Gaius*. This is one of the subjects that needs further inquiry, and will probably throw no small light on the history of the Church at the end of the second century.

These results may be held to be certain. To them we may add as being highly probable, though not of the same order of probability as the others :—

4. The Muratorian Canon stood at or near the beginning of the treatise against Gaius in which Hippolytus defended the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XV. THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE SON.

(1) THE religious consciousness of Jesus has a deeper significance and a greater value for the thought and life of mankind than even His moral character, the perfection of which engaged our attention in the last study. He has revealed the Fatherhood of God by realizing the sonship of man in Himself, but not for Himself alone ; as in Him the Son all men may see, and be led to, the Father. Although the official title *the Christ* has become part of His personal name, and His immediate historical function was the Jewish Messiahship, yet His universal and permanent position in, and service to, the race is not expressed in this office ; and it is probable that in His own consciousness the Messiahship was not so original or essential an element as the Sonship.

(2) In order to apprehend and exhibit His religious consciousness as completely as possible, however, it is necessary that we should begin with the meaning and the worth of the Messiahship for Jesus Himself. It has been already observed that He transcended the popular expectations and even the prophetic predictions regarding *the Christ*. The beliefs and hopes which attached to the Messiah as the Son of David He seems entirely to have disregarded. He was addressed as such by two blind men, on whom He strictly enjoined silence regarding their cure (Matt. ix. 27), by the Syrophenician woman (xv. 22), by blind Bartimaeus (Mark x. 47), by the crowds at the Triumphal Entry (Matt. xxi. 9, 15) ; but He never applied the title to Himself, and even in His controversy with the scribes suggested a difficulty in regard to it (Mark xii. 35). The knowledge of Davidic descent seems with Him not to have counted for anything. He, on the other hand, did expressly accept

the title of the Christ. He revealed Himself as the Christ to the woman of Samaria (John iv. 26). He pronounced Peter blessed for confessing Him as the Christ (Matt. xvi. 17). He answered the High Priest's question "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" affirmatively (Mark xiv. 61, 62). The Fourth Gospel represents Martha as making confession of His Messiahship (John xi. 27). It is very improbable that He Himself used the term Christ as a personal name, as He is reported to have done in the same Gospel (xvii. 3). The function of the Messiah as prophet, as the revealer of truth to men, is indicated in the words of the woman of Samaria, and is thus accepted by Jesus; and the multitude recognized in Him the prophet (John vi. 14). It was generally expected that the Messiah would work miracles (John vii. 31), and to the fulfilment of this hope Jesus points in His answer to the Baptist (Matt. xi. 4, 5).

(3) That answer contains a reference to Isaiah lxi. 1, the passage which Jesus read, and declared to be fulfilled in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 21). It has already been pointed out that Jesus' answer to the Baptist's objection to baptize Him, "Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15) probably is an allusion to the "righteous servant" of Isaiah liii., and that the Baptist's description of Jesus as the Lamb of God (John i. 29, 36) is possibly an echo of some communication Jesus had made to him privately regarding His own intention to realize this prophetic ideal (see the fourth Study). The fulfilment of the prophecy of the Servant was seen in Jesus by the first Evangelist (Matt. xii. 18-21 is a quotation from Isaiah xlii. 1-4). That Jesus conceived His function to be to offer Himself as a sacrifice for the sin of man will be shown fully in the next Study; but meanwhile it may be confidently affirmed that Jesus drew His conception of

His Messiahship from the writings of the prophet of the Exile. In thus connecting the Messiahship with this prophetic ideal Jesus was absolutely original. It is now generally agreed among scholars that there was no expectation of a suffering Messiah, and that in Jewish thought the Messiah and the Servant of Jehovah, righteous yet suffering, had never been identified. The identification, if not suggested to the mind of Jesus, may have been confirmed for Him by the reference to the *anointing* of the Servant (Isa. lxi. 1). The goodly remnant in the Jewish people laid stress on the Messiah's function "to give knowledge of salvation unto his people in the remission of their sins" (Luke i. 77); but Jesus alone saw that the salvation involved the Messiah's sacrifice. It was in accordance with the conditions of the Incarnation that He should have been led to a recognition of His vocation by a study of the Holy Scriptures, which it was His aim to fulfil.

(4) Jesus does not, however, use the term *Servant* of Himself; and two reasons why He did not may be suggested; in the first place, it would have contradicted what has already been described as the original, essential element of His consciousness, His sense of sonship; and in the second place, it would have involved a premature disclosure both to His disciples and to the people of His ideal. He needed a title that would express His own consciousness without committing Him in any way to the popular expectations on the one hand, or interfere with the gradual education of His own disciples on the other hand. He found this in the term *Son of Man*. There is still abundant controversy regarding the source and the significance of the term; but into this it would be altogether contrary to the purpose of this series of Studies to enter. After careful consideration of the matter the writer's conclusion is that Jesus Himself did use the term, that He did not use it impersonally as

indicating mankind generally, but personally as defining His own distinctive function, that it was not in current use as a designation of the Messiah, and that it was chosen to conceal His Messianic claim while serving gradually to reveal the contents of His Messianic ideal. That He was familiar with the *Similitudes* of the *Book of Enoch* the writer does not consider probable, and even if Jesus were so familiar, it seems to him still less probable that the significance of the term in the Gospels is to be determined by its meaning in that writing. We may be sure that He put His own meaning into the term He chose. It is by no means certain, as is sometimes assumed, that the *Book of Daniel* suggested the term to Him, although in the eschatological passages in which it is used a reference to that book is probable. There are other passages, however, which seem to show that Psalm viii. first of all suggested the use of the term. It is impossible, however, to trace the varied uses of the title by Him to one source.

(5) Before investigating the meaning of the term we may classify the passages in which it occurs. The habits of the *Son of Man* are described; He "came eating and drinking" (Matt. xi. 19), and He "hath not where to lay His head" (viii. 20). His varied functions are indicated; He hath "authority on earth to forgive sins" (ix. 6), "is lord of the Sabbath" (xii. 8), "soweth the good seed" (xiii. 37), "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (xx. 28), "came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke xix. 10). His passion and resurrection are foretold; He "must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again" (Mark viii. 31; cf. Matt. xvii. 22, xx. 18, xxvi. 2), He "shall suffer" like Elijah (Matt. xvii. 12), He "goeth as it is written of Him" (xxvi. 24), He "is betrayed into

the hands of sinners by a kiss" (xxvi. 24, 45, 49). His second coming is frequently referred to (Matt. x. 23, xiii. 41, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28, xxiv. 27, 30, 37, 39, 44, xxv. 31); the most significant allusion is in Jesus' answer to the high priest, "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (xxvi, 64). A few passages cannot be classified: "A word against the Son of Man shall be forgiven" (Matt. xii. 32); the disciples shall be reproached "for the Son of Man's sake" (Luke vi. 22); He "will confess before the angels of God" those who "confess Him before men" (xii. 8); He is a sign to His own generation as was Jonah to the Ninevites (xi. 30); there will be desire to see one of His days (xvii. 22). That the term Son of Man was not a recognized title of the Messiah is proved by Jesus' question which called forth Peter's confession, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" (Matt. xvi. 13). Another evidence is the bewilderment of the people as reported in the Fourth Gospel: "Who is this Son of Man?" (John xii. 34). In this Gospel the title is of less frequent occurrence. The disciples shall "see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (i. 51); He "which is in heaven descended out of heaven" and "must be lifted up" (iii. 13, 14; cf. vi. 62, viii. 28). He gives eternal life by the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood (vi. 27, 53), He is being glorified (xii. 23; cf. xiii. 31) in His death. It has been generally affirmed that this title is used by Jesus only, and never by any other, except Stephen (Acts vii. 56); but some of the passages in the Fourth Gospel seem to be either reflexions of the Evangelist (as iii. 13, 14) or utterances of Jesus translated into the Evangelist's peculiar phraseology (as vi. 27, 52); and we cannot, therefore, confidently use any of the Johannine passages to determine the significance of the phrase. Apart,

however, from the references to the descent from heaven (iii. 13, vi. 62), and the constant intercourse with the open heaven (i. 51), they do not add anything that would essentially modify the conception indicated by the Synoptic passages. Humiliation is as prominent as exaltation, humility as dignity, in these allusions, and it is therefore impossible to define the conception from one exclusive point of view. The predicates assigned to the Son of Man do not give to the term any distinctive meaning.

(6) It is not improbable that Psalm viii. suggested some of the uses of the title. Just as the Psalmist was surprised at God's condescension in being mindful of, and visiting man (verse 4) so Jesus lived in a glad and thankful wonder at the goodness of His Father to Him. He did make lofty claims for Himself ; but His spirit of lowliness was expressed in the title with which these claims were associated. It was as crowned by God with glory and honour that He forgave sins, was lord of the Sabbath, gave His life a ransom for many, sought and saved the lost. In distinguishing Himself from mankind in claiming these distinctive functions for the good of men, He yet identified Himself with the race to which He brought these Divine gifts. His humility towards God is expressed in this title as well as His sympathy towards man. He came to fulfil the prophecy of the Jewish Messiah, but He chose a title for Himself that ignored, and so implicitly denied, these local limitations. It has been already sufficiently shown that the love of Jesus was universal in its range ; and we are surely justified in finding in this universal love one reason for His adoption of this title. In His ministry He was compelled often to submit to the limitations which Jewish exclusiveness imposed, but the name by which He chose to be known was a constant protest against this temporary restriction of His ministry. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that Jesus

meant by the use of this title to so assert His similarity to other men as to deny His superiority. It was because there was no natural identity that it was necessary for Him thus to intimate His voluntary identification with the race. A sense of difference of moral character, of religious consciousness, of historical position and function, is expressed, as well as the desire for union with the race, so that He might become the channel of divine grace to it.

(7) For such reasons probably Jesus chose the title Son of Man; but what was the original and essential element in His consciousness was expressed in the title Son of God, which He used, if at all, with very much greater reserve. It was a not altogether unfamiliar phrase to Jewish ears. It is used in the Old Testament of angels (Gen. vi. 2, 4), of judges or rulers (Ps. lxxxii. 6), of the theocratic king (2 Sam. vii. 14: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son"), of the theocratic people (Exod. iv. 22; cf. Hos. xi. 1), of the Messiah (Ps. lxxxix. and ii.). That this was a current designation of the Messiah seems to be indicated by the use of it by the demoniacs (Mark iii. 11, v. 7). The centurion's words at the Cross (xv. 39), which may be rendered *a Son of God* as well as *the Son of God*, may express pagan superstition rather than Jewish belief. We cannot be sure that the use of the title in the Fourth Gospel, as by the Baptist (i. 34) and Nathanael (i. 49), or even by Christ Himself (v. 25, ix. 35, x. 36, xi. 4), is not an echo of contemporary Christian belief; as it was natural for the Evangelist, writing after so long an interval of time, to ante-date theological terms. This remark applies also to Matthew xiv. 33, xxvi. 63. One hesitates about applying the same criticism to Peter's Confession in Matthew xvi. 16, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; but uncertainty must be induced by the comparison of the parallel records. Mark has only the words, "Thou art

the Christ" (viii. 29), and Luke "the Christ of God" (ix. 20). If Peter did use the term, we must beware of importing into it all that it afterwards meant. He would use it as the loftiest title of the Messiah; and so would any who might have employed it during the earthly ministry of Jesus. We must not assume, however, that Jesus regarded His Divine sonship as primarily and distinctively a Messianic honour or prerogative; but must seek for the roots of this religious consciousness in His unique nature.

(8) How soon the consciousness of sonship was awakened in Jesus we cannot tell; but it is probable that the revelation came to Him gradually in correspondence with His mental, moral, and spiritual development. From the beginning of His conscious and voluntary temporal existence His attitude toward God was filial trust in, love for, surrender to Him. Whether any external communication from His mother regarding the wonder and promise of His birth, made with such reticence as regards details as His youth imposed, was divinely used to evoke certainty and confidence regarding His unique relation to God we cannot be certain; but that is at least probable (see the third Study). The interest such an intimation would awaken, and the enthusiasm it would kindle, may explain the mood of absorption in the Temple which made Him remain behind in Jerusalem, and inspired His answer to His mother's reproach, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" (Luke ii. 49). The silent years in Nazareth witnessed a continuous development of this religious consciousness, and the corresponding moral character. When the conviction of His Messiahship, and the conception of the nature of His vocation as prefigured by the righteous Servant of Jehovah came to Him we have no indication; but, as both the Messianic hope and the prophetic ideal belonged to the realm of history, Jesus'

knowledge of both must have been a mediated knowledge ; it was as He studied the Scriptures that the conviction was deepened and the conception was defined. His filial consciousness, on the other hand, belonged originally and essentially to His own nature ; it was the temporal revealing of the eternal secret of the inner life of God Himself. This filial consciousness so pervades and dominates the mind and heart and will of Jesus, that it is incredible that it can at first have been an inference drawn from His Messianic vocation. It was surely an immediate intuition. The voice at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 17 ; Mark i. 11 ; Luke iii. 22) did not discover to Him a secret hitherto hidden from Him ; but conveyed to Him who already knew Himself as Son the assurance of the Father's affection and approval in His acceptance of His vocation. It was not His sense of sonship that needed confirmation, but His choice of the service which as Son He was offering to the Father. So also the voice at the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5 ; Mark ix. 7 ; Luke ix. 35) did not meet any doubt of Jesus regarding His Sonship, but confirmed for the sake of the disciples present as well as for Himself His resolve to offer Himself in death as "a ransom for many." Whatever may have been the nature of the Divine manifestations on both occasions they were addressed to a consciousness receptive and responsive to such communications ; they did not constitute, but were conditioned by, His sense of sonship.

(9) During His ministry He spoke habitually of God as Father, and Himself as Son. Although He revealed God as Father of all men, and taught His disciples unitedly to pray "Our Father," yet He did not so identify Himself with men as to represent Himself as only one among many equal sons of God. He speaks of God as "my Father" (Matt. vii. 21, x. 32, xv. 13, xvi. 17, xviii. 10) in utterances in which, if He had not recognized something unique in

His relation to God, He might have been expected to say "our Father." In two parables this distinctive character of His sonship is indicated. In the parable of the husbandmen the "beloved son" is distinguished from the servants, and is described by the husbandmen as "the heir" (Mark xii. 6, 7). In the parable of the marriage feast the king's son is the bridegroom (Matt. xxii. 2. Compare the parable of the Ten Virgins, xxv. 1). What was implied in this relation between the Father and the Son is indicated in a few passages. The passage in the Synoptic Gospels which is of supreme significance is found in Matthew xi. 25-27 and Luke x. 21, 22. In this utterance of as profound emotion as sublime thought, the Divine ordering of His ministry is gratefully accepted in absolute submission to the Divine will. In the words "all things have been delivered unto me of my Father" there is not a claim to universal dominion, but a confession of entire dependence. All the words and works are given to Him by God, and, therefore, the absolute submission is appropriate to the entire dependence. But the entire dependence and the absolute submission not only accompany, but surely result from the unique intimacy. If His sonship were shared, it would be understood by men; but it is to them as much a secret as is the Divine fatherhood until revealed by Him. God's knowledge of Him is as exclusive as is His knowledge of God. It need hardly be said that there is here no claim to Divine omniscience, but only to a unique knowledge and revelation of God as Father in a unique self-knowledge as Son. Jesus Himself confesses a limitation of His knowledge of the will of the Father concerning Himself as Son. The words in Mark xiii. 32 have already been discussed in dealing, in the twelfth Study with the limitation of the knowledge of Jesus; but now we return to them to notice only that Jesus as the Son not only distinguishes Himself from men, but even from the angels in

heaven ; and thus indicates that it is possible for things hidden from men and angels to be revealed to the Son. This intimate knowledge is allied with an intense affection. He is the beloved Son, and His whole life shows His love to His Father ; although in the Synoptists this communion of love between Father and Son is not laid bare to us. But affection beautifies and glorifies both the dependence and the submission shown.

(10) With this inmost life of Jesus the Fourth Gospel deals without any of the reserve which is characteristic of the Synoptists. It is not at all improbable that there was in the company of the disciples one with whom Jesus had a closer intimacy of intercourse due to greater affinity of nature, and that the Fourth Gospel supplements the Synoptics in these matters of most sacred interest. But at the same time the Gospel is so evidently doctrine as well as history, that we cannot confidently and certainly distinguish the Evangelist's reminiscences and reflexions ; and we must also recognize the possibility that the Evangelist's comment on utterances he may have preserved correctly may be rather a theological development than a historical exposition. The claims made by Jesus, according to the testimony of this Gospel, to be the Water of Life (vii. 37, 38), the Light of the World (viii. 12, ix. 5), the Good Shepherd (x. 11-16), the Resurrection and the Life (xi. 25), and the True and Living Way to God (xiv. 6) do not necessarily transcend what is involved in His claims according to the Synoptists to forgive sins, seek and save the lost, give His life a ransom for many, be Judge of all the nations, determine the future fate of men by their present attitude to Himself. Even the statement "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (xiv. 9) is but a vivid expression of His claim to reveal the Father as Son. The discussion in John iii. 13-21 as an utterance of Jesus seems to be in the highest degree improbable both at

the early stage in Jesus' ministry in which it is placed, and with the sceptical inquirer to whom it is addressed : probably Nicodemus; was dismissed with the altogether appropriate words reported in verse 12 ; and at verse 13 reminiscence passes into reflexion. That Jesus described Himself as "descended out of heaven," and as the "only begotten Son" cannot be affirmed, however appropriate these phrases may be to express the faith of the Christian Church regarding Him. If the Evangelist endorses as well as reports the accusation of the Jews that Jesus in calling "God His own Father" was "making Himself equal with God" (v. 18), the context does not justify his or the Jews' inference. When Jesus said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (verse 17), it was surely in filial humility and submission that He claimed the warrant of the Divine example. The argument with which He met this charge, as recorded in x. 35, 36, confirms this conclusion. While He did not place Himself merely on an equality with the judges called gods in Psalm lxxxii. 6, yet He placed His sonship on the basis that "the Father sanctified and sent Him into the world" (verse 36). This was surely not making Himself equal with God. So when He declares that "I and the Father are one" (verse 30) it is to do violence to the historical significance of the words to find in them an evidence of co-substantiality as affirmed by the Creeds. All the context demands, and therefore warrants, is identity of purpose in Father and Son. As if expressly to exclude any such inference, Jesus affirms, "My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all" (verse 29) ; and He does not exclude Himself as an exception, for the reason of His joy in His going to the Father is this : "The Father is greater than I" (xiv. 28). It is in the light of such declarations that we must interpret a saying such as this, "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine" (xvi. 15). The context also does

define the "all things" as "all the truth," the content of the revelation of the Father in the Son. The dependence, subordination, and submission of the Son to the Father are clearly taught in the Fourth Gospel; the Son can do only what He sees the Father doing (v. 19, 20), He speaks as the Father has taught Him (viii. 28), the Father hath given Him the commandment what He should speak (xii. 49), He makes known what He has heard from the Father (xv. 15), His revelation of God has been given Him (xvii. 11).

(11) His sense of sonship was always consistent with humility, reverence, and obedience as well as confidence, affection, and dignity. To import the metaphysics of the Creeds into the consciousness of Jesus is not only an error, it is a wrong. It makes the appreciation of Jesus as "the meek and lowly in heart" impossible. Not in doubt or denial of His real divinity, but in order that we may form a worthy conception of His Person, is it necessary to insist that sonship, as the term itself implies, meant for Him dependence and submission. While this religious consciousness of Jesus is inexplicable by common manhood, it is, so conceived, not inconsistent with real humanity. To trust and love and serve God as a Son is the ideal for man, first realized in Him, and realizable in others through Him. To claim equality with God is not an ideal for man, and Jesus would have severed Himself from the race with which He identifies Himself as Son of Man had He meant that when He called Himself the Son of God.

(12) It has sometimes been argued, however, that this subordination of the Son to the Father applies only to the days of His Flesh. As regards the exaltation after the Resurrection Paul, who teaches that the name of Jesus is above every name, also teaches that it is God that highly exalted Him, and gave Him this name, and that the confession of Jesus Christ as Lord is to the glory of God the

Father (Phil. ii. 9, 11). He too affirms that at the end the Son also Himself shall be subjected, that God may be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). As regards the pre-existence it has been disputed whether the term *Son* is applicable to the relation of the *Word* to God ; but if God is affection as well as intelligence, the latter term must be regarded as less adequate than the former. If we believe that the temporal consciousness of Jesus expressed eternal truth, then we may affirm that the subordination of Sonship to Fatherhood is eternal in the Godhead itself. Although the writer shrinks from speculation on these high themes, he may venture one step further, and conjecture that the temporal *kenosis* in the Incarnation is made possible by, nay, is due to, the eternal *kenosis* in the nature of God. The characteristics of the Incarnate belong also to the Eternal Sonship. If this be so, Jesus' consciousness of pre-existence would be not discordant, but harmonious with His humility and obedience, as there would be identity of moral and religious quality. It is true that this consciousness finds expression only in two passages in the Fourth Gospel (viii. 58, xvii. 5), and that we cannot be altogether certain that these are not interpretation rather than testimony. Accepting them, however, as authentic sayings of Jesus, how can we interpret them as consistent with the real humanity, of which we have just spoken ? We cannot and we need not assume a continuous consciousness from the pre-existent to the incarnate state of the Son of God. We have no proof that Jesus had any remembrance of the conditions of His pre-existence to hinder, or interfere with, His normal personal development. Not as an inference derived from, but as an intuition implied in, His sense of sonship there came to Him the certainty that His relation to God did not begin in time, but was eternal. So immediate was His vision of, so intimate His communion with, so intense His affection for, so absolute His submission

to, God as His Father, that His relation to God stood before Him as eternal reality. When this intuition came to Him, at what stage of His personal development the temporal disclosure of the eternal secret became possible, we cannot tell. Possibly it was His submission to the will of His Father that He should die, that was rewarded with the paternal assurance which inspired the filial certainty that His was an eternal life in God. What for a few daring thinkers has been a speculation about the origin of man in God was to Jesus a personal experience. Because He so lived in God He knew Himself to have come from God as His Eternal Son.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

*THE SECOND TEMPLE, FROM ZECHARIAH
TO EZRA.*

THE builders of the Second Temple completed their work in March 516 B.C., the last month of the sixth year of Darius.¹ The data of its size, appearance, and furniture are meagre and ambiguous. No inference can be drawn from the words of Haggai,² that in the eyes of them who had seen Solomon's Temple, the new House was as nothing; for the prophet spoke when the builders had been but a few weeks at work. That their disappointment was not with the scale of their building, but with the lack of materials to enrich it, is proved by the prophet's promise that God Himself would provide these later.³ Haggai's expression, *Who among you that saw this House in its former glory* does not imply, as has been supposed, that, though ruined, the fabric of the old House was still standing.⁴ The hypothesis is contradicted by the thoroughness with which annalists and poets alike describe

¹ Adar, the last of the Babylonian year; on the 3rd day, according to the Aramaic document in the Bk. of Ezra, vi. 15; but on the 23rd, according to 1 Esdras.

² ii. 3.

³ ii. 7, 8.

⁴ So Guthe, *Gesch.* 264; cf. 270.

the destruction by Nebuchadrezzar, and by the accounts of the rebuilding under Darius. The latter was started from the foundation, *before a stone was laid on a stone*,¹ and it took four and a half years to accomplish—ample time for an entire reconstruction, for which little or no quarrying would be required. It is most probable that the outlines of the First Temple could still be traced, and that these were followed in the reconstruction, particularly of the Sanctuary itself.² This consisted, as before, of two parts: the Holy Place, and the Holy of Holies, the *hēkal* and the *dēbîr*. In front of the *hēkal* was the *'ulam*, the Porch or Vestibule. There were also, as formerly, *chambers* or *cells*, built against the Sanctuary and round its court.³ It is impossible to determine exactly what the furniture of the Sanctuary was before the institution by Ezra and Nehemiah of the Priestly Code. The historical references to the subject are all much later. Only this is certain, that the Holy of Holies, which in Solomon's Temple had held the Ark, was in Zerubbabel's empty⁴; and that in the Holy Place, which was probably

¹ Hag. ii. 15.

² Ezra vi. 3 states that Cyrus had decreed that the new Temple should be 60 cubits high and 60 broad (Solomon's having been 60 long, 20 broad, and 30 high). But the text of this verse is not reliable. Ewald (*Hist.*, Eng. tr., v. 113) accepts the height of 60 cubits, but confines the enlargement to the external three-storied building. Josephus (*C. Apion*, i. 22) quotes from the *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων*—a work ascribed to Hecataeus of Abdera, 306–283 B.C., perhaps wrongly, but quoted as early as the Letter of Aristeas, c. 200 B.C.—a statement that the whole area of the Second Temple, within the *enceinte* of its court, was 5 plethra long by 100 (Greek) cubits broad, or practically 162 yards by 48½. See T. Reinach, *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, pp. 227 ff.

³ Ezra viii. 29, Neh. x. 37 f., xiii. 4, 7–9. Cf. *the storehouse* for tithes, Mal. iii. 10. On these *chambers* in the First Temple see EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1906, p. 103. 1 Macc. iv. 38, 57 describes *παστοφορεία*, or priests' colls, as by the gates in the walls of the court.

⁴ Cf. *Talm. Bab.* "Yoma," 22 b. Josephus, in a well-known passage, *B.J.* v. 5, says of the Holy of Holies, *ἐκεῖτο δὲ οὐδὲν ἔλας ἐν αὐτῷ*; cf. the "inania arcana" of Tac., *Hist.* v. 9. According to the *Mishna*, "Yoma," v. 2., the foundation stone הַבְּנֵי הַבַּיִת שֶׁבַח , three finger-broadths high, lay in the *dēbîr*, and on it the high-priest laid his censor; and later on the day of Atonement set the blood.

already separated from the inner sanctuary by a curtain,¹ stood the Table of Shewbread and, in place of the former ten several candlesticks, one seven-branched lamp.²

What provision was made for the offering of incense? It is very doubtful whether incense had been used in the worship of Israel before the reign of Manasseh. There is no mention of it, in either the earlier historical books, or the first two codes, or the descriptions of ritual by the eighth century prophets.³ Jeremiah speaks of frankincense as an innovation in the worship of Jahweh.⁴ Ezekiel is the first to use the term *ketoreth*, which in the earlier literature means *the smoke or savour of the burnt offering*, for a cloud of incense smoke, and he does so in connexion with idolatrous worship.⁵ The earliest prophet to imply that incense may have a place in the legal worship of Israel is the great Evangelist of the Exile⁶; and after the Return, sometime (as we shall see) before 450 B.C., another prophet predicts that in the approaching glory of Jerusalem frankincense shall be brought to her from Sheba.⁷ We may therefore assume that even

¹ Later on *veils or curtains* hung in the doorways both of the sanctuary and the holy of holies (1 Macc. i. 22, iv. 51), as in the description of the Tabernacle (Exod. xxvi. 36).

² Zech. iv. Cf. 1 Macc. i. 21, iv. 49, 50, Jos. xiv., *Antt.* iv. 4. Ezekiel xli. 22 and xlv. 16 f. prescribes an altar-like table of wood, *the table before Jahweh*, and he speaks of the priests as serving the table.

³ In Deut. xxxiii. 10 and Isa. i. 13, קַטְוֹרֶה or קַטְוֹרֶת, rendered *incense* in the English versions, is the *smoke or savour of the burnt offering*—so with the use of the verb קָטַר (Amos iv. 5)—all these refer to Israel's proper ritual. In the same sense the verb is used of heathen ritual: Hos. iv. 13, xi. 2; Jer. xix. 13 (?). Before the seventh century, then, incense does not seem to have been employed in Israel, though in use both in Babylonian and Egyptian temples from a very early date.

⁴ לְבִנְהָ

⁵ In Ezek. xvi. 18 and xxiii. 41, where Jahweh charges His people with offering קַטְוֹרֶתַי (Eng. versions, *mine incense*) to idols, it is doubtful whether *incense* or *the smoke of the burnt offering* is intended.

⁶ Isa. xliii. 23.

⁷ Isa. lx. 6. In the contemporary Malachi, i. 11, נִקְטָר (if genuine?) means only *is burnt* or *sacrificed*.

before the worship was arranged in conformity with the Priestly Code, which makes ample provision for incense, the latter was used in the Second Temple. But we cannot tell whether as yet it was burned only in censers in the hands of the priests, or whether the altar of incense which afterwards stood in the Holy Place of the Second Temple was there from the beginning.¹

The only altar mentioned during this period² is that of the burnt offering raised by the returned exiles in 536 on the site of Solomon's in the court before the Sanctuary. Josephus quotes Hecataeus, who describes it as a square of 20 cubits and 10 in height, built of undressed stones. Probably this was the same which stood there from the first. The *bronze sea* of Solomon's Temple does not appear to have been repeated.³

The Court before the Sanctuary had walls with doors.⁴ But there were more courts than one; *they that have gathered the wine*, says a prophet already cited,⁵ *shall drink it in the courts of my Sanctuary*. Probably the Courts were two, as in the programme of Ezekiel, but, contrary to his reservation of the Inner Court to the priests, the laity, as we see from the verse just quoted, were admitted to both, and this right seems to have lasted till the time of Alexander Jannaeus, who as he stood by the Altar was pelted with citrons by a crowd of worshippers and retaliated by building a wooden fence round the Altar, within which only the priests were admitted.⁶ To the gates of these Courts we will return with Nehemiah.

¹ Hecataeus (see above) describes in the Sanctuary an altar as well as a lamp, both of gold. Ezekiel (see note 3 on previous page) prescribes no altar in the Sanctuary, but only *an altar-like table*, i.e. of the showbread.

² Mal. i. 10 f.

³ The first reference to a laver in the Second Temple is in the *Mishna*, "Middoth," iii. 6.

⁴ Mal. i. 10.

⁵ Isa. lxii. 9.

⁶ Josephus, xiii. *Antt.* xiii. 5.

Thus, then, stood the Second Temple on the lines of, and as large as, the First, but doubtless barer and more rough : the work of a smaller and poorer people, without commerce, threatened by many adversaries and with the walls of their City still in ruin. One great difference between the new and the old House must have impressed itself upon the people, and was certainly significant of their future history. The First Temple had risen as but a part of a great complex of royal buildings—a palace, a judgment hall, barracks, and an arsenal—round the whole of which there ran one enclosing wall. Of these none was now rebuilt. The Second Temple rose alone, without civic or political rival, a spiritual Capitol within its own courts and surrounding wall. This wall is probably referred to in the ambiguous statement of the Book of Ezra : *three courses of great stones and a course of new timber.*¹

To the completion of the Temple Haggai and Zechariah look forward, as the opening of a period of material and spiritual glory. The droughts and barren years have been due to the people's negligence in building the House of the Lord ; but now He will bless their labours.² There has been no hire for man and beast, and with so many adversaries trade is impossible ; but God is already *sowing the seed of peace ; the vine shall yield her fruit, the land her increase, the heavens their dew, and all shall be a heritage to the remnant of this people.*³ The Fasts instituted in the Exile to commemorate the destruction of the City are to be changed to Feasts.⁴ The sorry populations of Jerusalem and other towns shall grow and overflow the land ; *Jerusalem shall be inhabited as villages without walls, spreading by suburbs*

¹ Ezra vi. 4 ; LXX., *one course of timber*. Cf. 1 Kings vi. 36, where the wall of the single court of the First Temple is said to have *three courses of hewn stones and a course of cedar beams*.

² Hag. i. 10 f., ii. 16–19.

³ Zech. viii. 9–12 ; cf. Hag. i. 6.

⁴ Zech. viii. 18 f.

far into the country, *by reason of the multitude of men and cattle therein*¹: her streets full of men and women living to a secure and comfortable old age, and of boys and girls at play²; her festivals crowded with pilgrims, yea even with many peoples and strong *nations coming to seek Jahweh of Hosts in Jerusalem and to entreat His favour*.³ For *the Lord has returned to Sion and Jerusalem shall be called The City of Truth, and the mountain of Jahweh of Hosts the Holy Mountain*.⁴ The iniquity of the land shall be removed in one day.⁵

This prediction of the future of Israel from the standpoint of the new community repeats the essential notes of the older prophecy. First, the conditions of its fulfilment are ethical. Zechariah summons the people to put away^r their civic wickedness and rise to a purer and more unselfish life.⁶ Again, the promised restoration is connected with the prophet's expectancy of an immediate *shaking* of the whole world.⁷ As with the older prophets so with Haggai and Zechariah, the reasons of such an assurance are the political signs of their own times. Darius has not yet made his throne secure. In some of the provinces there are revolts, in others restlessness. And finally, Haggai and Zechariah concentrate their political hopes for Israel on the person of a descendant of David: yet he is no future and unnamed prince, as with their predecessors, but their own contemporary and governor, Zerubbabel, who in the day that the world is shaken, shall be as a *signet ring*,⁸ so manifest an authority is to descend upon him. *The mountain of obstacles, says Zechariah, shall become as a plain before him*.⁹ *He shall bear the glory and rule from his throne with the priest at his right hand*.¹⁰

¹ ii. 4. ² viii. 4 f.

³ viii. 20 ff. ⁴ viii. 3; cf. ii. 10 ff. ⁵ iii. 5.

⁶ i. 4, vi. 15, viii. 16 f.

⁷ Hag. ii. 6 ff., 21 ff.; Zech. i. 15, ii. 8 ff.

⁸ Hag. ii. 21, 23, ⁹ iv. 7. ¹⁰ vi. 13, LXX.

These great hopes for the immediate future were not fulfilled. Darius crushed his adversaries and organised his Empire in peace. The world was not shaken. Zerubbabel vanished ; what became of him we are not told. It has been variously conjectured that he succumbed to the intrigues of the party among his own countrymen who favoured the supremacy of the high priest ; or that his governorship was abolished when Darius divided the Empire into twenty Satrapies ; or that he fell in an unsuccessful revolt against his Persian lord. The hypothesis has even been ventured that his fall involved the destruction of the new Temple by the enraged Persians.¹ For none of these suppositions have we any evidence ; the fourth of them is not only extremely improbable, but if the Temple had fallen some allusion must have been preserved in the Book of Ezra. All we are sure of is the disappearance of the last prince of the House of David, who ruled or bore the semblance of rule in Jerusalem. Not in vain had the returned exiles refrained from restoring the Palace beside the Temple. Zerubbabel's end meant the end of the dynasty with whose founder the City had risen, and to whose kings alone she had given her allegiance. No other scion of the family was henceforth to be acknowledged by her ; they sank into obscurity. Even prophecy, which had flourished round their throne, and hitherto pledged its faith in their permanence, gave up its hope of them before it too expired, as if unable

¹ So Sellin, dating it between 515 and 500, on the grounds (1) of the present text of Isa. lxiii. 18 (*thy holy people were in possession but a little while ; our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary*), and lxiv. 10 ff. (*thy holy cities . . . and Jerusalem a desolation ; our holy house . . . is burned with fire*) ; and (2) because only so great a catastrophe could explain the sudden collapse of the Messianic hopes centred on Zerubbabel. But the text of the above passages is uncertain, and their reference to the destruction by Nebuchadrezzar very possible ; and equally great Messianic hopes had been abandoned in earlier times without requiring so great a catastrophe as the cause.

to exist apart from the independent national life with which they had been identified. The Temple, the Temple alone, remained; and the Priest, as we see from the significant alterations in the text of Zechariah's oracles, bare rule over a kingless and a prophetless people.

For the next fifty or sixty years, till the arrival of Ezra and Nehemiah, with the new law and its energy of reform, we owe our information to some of the last efforts of prophecy, in forms no longer original but resting either upon the law or upon the prophetic literature of former times. One anonymous prophet, to whom our Canon gives the name of "Malachi,"¹ uttered his oracles either just before or just after the arrival of Ezra; and another series of prophecies (Isa. lvi.-lxvi.) are most probably assigned to the same period, because, though containing some apparently earlier elements, they not only reflect what we know were the main features of life in Jerusalem between Zechariah and Ezra, but contain some parallels to "Malachi," and echoes of Ezekiel, the great Evangelist of the Exile, and Zechariah.²

¹ See *The Book of the Twelve Prophets (Expositor's Bible)*, ii. ch. xxiv.

² The existence of the Temple is implied throughout the greater part of Isa. lvi.-lxvi., especially lvi. 7, 8, lxii. 9 (the courts of the Temple), lxvi. 6. Some exiles have returned; others have still to be gathered (lvi. 8, lvii. 14, 19, lx. 4 ff.). The walls of Jerusalem are still unbuilt, and there are many *old* waste places (lviii. 12, lx. 10). There are very many idolaters practising, amidst scenery that is Palestinian (lvi. 9-lvii.), cults that are recognizable as those of the Western Semites (lvii. 9, lxv. 11; cf. lxv. 1-5). Some of these are undoubtedly Jews, *apostates* (lxvi. 24); others may be (not certainly are, as some commentators assert about lvii. 3 ff.) Samaritans. There is a great deal of trouble and strife with adversaries: this is implied in the many promises of peace. The faithful community is also abused by its governors, and its poor by its rich (lviii.-lix.). Altogether Jerusalem is like a pregnant mother who cannot bring her children to the birth (lxvi. 7-9).

Among other parallels with "Malachi" are lvi. 1-8 with Mal. iii. 5 (*turn aside the stranger*), lvi. 10 ff. with Mal. i. 10, ii. 1 ff.; the temper of lxiii. 7-lxiv. (on this see "Isaiah" in Hastings' *B.D.*), and the prediction of the separation of the good from the apostates and the judgment of the latter (Mal. iii. 13-21, Heb.—Eng. iii. 13-iv. 2—with Isa. lxv.-lxvi.). The treatment of the Fasts (lviii.) may be compared with Zech. viii. 14-19, and the phrase

The picture which these writings present to us is one of anarchy and depression, both in religion and civic affairs. The tone of the prophets is, therefore, for the most part, critical, sombre and minatory ; but it is relieved by passages of truth so spiritual, of charity so broad, and of hope so strong and dazzling that these have ever been esteemed by the Church of God as among the most precious of her Scriptures. It is not the City alone which is under review, but the land ; yet not, as with some older prophets, extended to its ideal boundaries, but shrunken almost to the limits of the people's actual possession : *Judah and Jerusalem* as "Malachi" calls it¹ ; while the other prophet dares not, even in promise, to define it as wider than from Sharon to Achor, mere *pasture and a place for herds to lie down in*.² The religious symbols and promised blessings of those prophets are largely pastoral and agricultural,³ as if the returned exiles had already spread beyond Jerusalem to these forms of life, and particularly, we may note, to the cultivation of the vine. Three classes of the population are discernible : the faithful Jews returned from Babylon ; the apostate Jews, consisting both of those who had never left the land and those of the Return who had fallen away to them ; and the Samaritans, who had spread into the Vale of Ajalon and held many of the approaches to the City. In addition the

my holy mountain (lvi. 7, lvii. 13, lxx. 11, 25, lxxvi. 20) recalls the prediction of Zechariah (viii. 3), and lxx. 20 Zech. viii. 4 ; and lxx. 16, *God of truth*, Zech. viii. 3, *City of truth*, 8 *their God in truth*. There is not space here to enumerate other parallels with Zechariah, or the one or two echoes of Ezekiel, or the many adoptions of texts in Isaiah xl.-lv.

The only difficulties in the way of assigning these chapters to the period are the references to the destruction of the Temple, on which see above ; and the assertion in lxxvi. that God does not dwell in temples made with hands, which, however, does not preclude the existence of the Temple (on this see Skinner, *Cambr. Bible for Schools*).

¹ iii. 4.

² Isa. lxx. 10.

³ Mal. iii. 11, iv. 2 (Eng.) ; Isa. lxi., lxii., lxiii. 2 ff., 13 f., lxx. 8, 22 ff., etc.

Edomites had come up the Negeb almost as far as Hebron ; there were some Ammonite settlements that had occupied fields from which Nebuchadrezzar took away their Jewish owners and had introduced the cult of Moloch or Melech ¹ ; and the Phoenician coast towns, as of yore, sent their traders through the land and with them their own forms of worship.²

To all these temptations the Jewish community was exposed, and the worship of the Temple had to compete with them. A foreign governor had succeeded Zerubbabel.³ We cannot suppose that he was sympathetic with the ideals or careful of the religious discipline of the City.⁴ In their worship priests and laity were left to themselves and grew careless. The former neglected the more spiritual of their duties ⁵ ; the latter cheapened their sacrifices and withheld their tithes.⁶ The Sabbath was abused ⁷ ; the pilgrimages to Şion fell off.⁸ Jews divorced their wives in order to marry the heathen.⁹ And the minds of the people reaped the natural fruit of such laxity, in the persuasion that right conduct mattered nothing. There was a prevalent scepticism.¹⁰ Sorcery, perjury, oppression of the poor, shedding of innocent blood, with a general covetousness and envy of the rich are the sins charged against the community.¹¹

From all this we can see how the work of Ezra and Nehemiah upon their arrival in Jerusalem was at once difficult and easy—difficult because the community was corrupted by nearly two generations of so much temptation and so much carelessness ; but easy because in the resultant

¹ Isa. lvii. 9.

² lxxv. 11.

³ Mal. i. 8.

⁴ Ryle, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (*Camb. Bible for Schools*), p. xxxvii.

⁵ Mal. ii. 1-9 ; cf. Isa. lvi. 10 ff.

⁶ Mal. i. 6 ff., iii. 7 ff.

⁷ Isa. lvi. 1-8, lviii. 13 f.

⁸ lxxv. 11.

⁹ Mal. ii. 10-16.

¹⁰ ii. 17, iii. 13 ff.

¹¹ Mal. iii. 5, 15 ; Isa. lvii. 17, lviii., lix. 3-8, 13-15.

anarchy there was no force, either moral or physical, sufficient to withstand the demands for reform. In estimating the work of Ezra and Nehemiah, the rapidity with which they imposed a new and an elaborate constitution upon the life of their people, we must appreciate the fact that they had to reckon, not with an established political system or long traditions or a disciplined hierarchy, but with a popular life broken into fragments and dispirited—corrupt, indeed, but flexible and at the entire disposal of any definite and straightforward purpose of reform.

This is not the place to follow or appraise the loftier flights of teaching upon which Malachi and his fellow prophets rose above their sombre tasks of tracking and dragging to light the vices and superstitions of their people. But we must not fail to notice how at a time when, as we have seen, prophecy indulged in no great hopes for the political future of the community and was engrossed with practical proposals for the improvement of the details of their life, it also possessed the spirit to rise to far visions of the world and to the widest charity and hope of other peoples. There are no passages of Scripture which breathe a more tender or a more universal spirit than some of these utterances from so narrow and dispirited an age. Malachi turns from his disgust with the blemished sacrifices of the Temple to the thought of how God is honoured everywhere among the heathen: *for from the rising of the sun to his setting My Name is glorified among the nations, and in every sacred place smoke of sacrifice ascends to My Name and a pure offering, for great is My Name among the nations, saith Jahweh of Hosts.*¹ A wonderful thought to rise from that starved and corrupt City, a wonderful claim to make for her God at such a time! How it anticipates the words of Christ in the same place centuries later, that God has re-

¹ Mal. i. 11.

jected Israel and called the Gentiles to Himself! The other prophet or prophets are in their own way equally catholic, equally spiritual. They make provision within Israel for the eunuch and the stranger¹; declare that God who inhabits the high and holy place *dwells also with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit*²; they emphasize that the service He seeks from men is the loosening of the bonds of wickedness, the undoing of the locks of the yoke and letting the oppressed go free³; they utter that programme of service which Christ took as His own: *to preach good tidings unto the meek, to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty unto the captives, and open ways to the prisoners, to proclaim an acceptable year for the Lord and a day of vengeance for our God; to comfort all that mourn; to offer unto the mourners of Sion, to give them a crest for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the mantle of praise for the spirit of dimness.*⁴

With regard to Jerusalem herself, the pictures are double and contradictory. Not in "Malachi," for he says as little of Jerusalem and as much implies her, as the Deuteronomic law, from within which he prophesies. But in Isaiah lvi.-lxvi. the City is now represented as the glorified centre of the whole world, embellished by its tribute and attracting its nations, and now as the floor of judgment on which her own people have to be separated and punished. Let us conclude this study with an instance of each of these: either from the same author in different moods or from different authors but of the same period.

In the sixtieth chapter we see Jerusalem bidden to arise to her glory, which is described as "the spiritual counterpart of a typical eastern day in the sudden splendour of its dawn, the completeness and apparent permanence of its

¹ Isa. lvi. 1-8.

² lvii. 15.

³ lviii. 6 ff.

⁴ lxi. 1 ff.

noon, the spaciousness it reveals on sea and land, and the barbaric profusion of life, which its strong light is sufficient to flood with glory.”¹ The prophet has caught that high central position of the City on the ridge that runs between sea and desert, east and west, the ends of the world. We have seen that her exposure is eastward and with this he begins.² Arabia, whose border is Jerusalem’s horizon, is pouring into her : *Profusion of camels shall cover thee, young camels of Midian and Ephah, all of them from Sheba shall come : gold and frankincense shall they bring and publish the praises of Jahweh. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered unto thee ; the rams of Nebaioth shall minister to thee : they shall come up with acceptance on Mine altar and the house of My glory will I glorify.* And then turning from this, the natural prospect of every housetop in the City, he overlooks the ridge which hides Jerusalem from the sea, and starts her hope in what till the days of her exile was a direction unknown. Nay, as if she had left her secluded mountain site and taken her stand by the sea, he describes her with all its light thrown up in her face and all its wealth drifting to her feet. *Then shalt thou see and be radiant, and thy heart throb and grow large ; for there shall be turned upon thee the tide of the sea, and the wealth of the nations shall come to thee. . . . Who are these like a cloud, that fly like doves to their windows ? Surely the Isles³ are stretching towards me, with ships of Tarshish in the van to bring thy sons from afar, their silver and their gold with them to the name of Jahweh of Hosts and to the Holy of Israel, for He hath glorified thee.* It is a picture, wonderful at this time when the life of the City was at its lowest, of the far future, when all the western world should come to Jerusalem with its gifts and

¹ *Isaiah xl.-lxvi.* (*Expositor’s Bible*, p. 429).

² Verses 6-9.

³ Or, coastlands.

its spiritual homage. But *the least was to become a thousand and the smallest a strong nation.*

The counterpart of this is seen in chapter lxvi., which tells how the glory of Jerusalem must be preceded by a great and searching judgment; between her citizens who are faithful and those who are apostate. The glorious notes of the future to which we have been listening are repeated, but our prophet's closing vision of the City is not that of a holy mountain, the abode of a holy people and the centre of a redeemed humanity, but with her narrow surface and her little people divided between worship and a horrible woe—Gehenna underneath the walls of the Temple. What was to have been the Lord's garner is still only His threshingfloor, and heaven and hell as of old shall from new moon to new moon lie side by side in her. "For from the day that Araunah the Jebusite threshed out his sheaves upon that high, wind-swept rock to the day when the Son of Man standing over against her divided in His last discourse the sheep from the goats, the wise from the foolish, and the loving from the selfish, Jerusalem has been appointed of God for trial, separation and judgment."¹

2

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ *Isaiah xl.-lxvi.* (*Expositor's Bible*, p. 466).

THE CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE attacks which have recently been directed against critics of the Old Testament and their criticism, though doubtless made with all sincerity, have occasionally been marked with an exaggeration and misrepresentation which their authors appear to regard as equivalent to argument and proof. Whilst one may deprecate the introduction of tactics which, however suitable upon a platform, are out of place in a serious question of this character, it is important to remember, *first*, that the opponents to criticism do not pay sufficient regard to the needs of those who study the Old Testament more especially for the light it throws upon ancient history, custom and thought; and, *secondly*, that the onslaughts are not directed against any new phase of criticism, but against a study which has been before the English public for a quarter of a century. When Robertson Smith published his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* in 1881, one of his chief aims was to show (which he did with his accustomed lucidity) that "Biblical criticism is not the invention of modern scholars, but the legitimate interpretation of historical facts"; and when the great Dutch critic, Kuenen, wrote his masterly essays on "the critical method" in the *Modern Review* in 1880, he refuted once and for all the various objections which were raised at that period and which a new generation is raising now. It is enough to say, perhaps, that the works of these and other great masters have silenced whatever doubts one may have had regarding the legitimacy of Old Testament criticism, and that those who use the book, for other than devotional purposes alone, find themselves unable to return to the standpoint of pre-critical days.

Now, much as the uncomplimentary estimate of Biblical criticism may be deplored, it seems only just to recognize

that the responsibility for it lies in great measure with those whose position gives their opinions the weight of authority. The ordinary man knows little enough, it may be, of historical criticism, much less of its application to Biblical study, and so long as his religious convictions are based upon a certain conception of the history of Israel, so long must critical results prove an offence to him. For it cannot be ignored that these results often differ most remarkably from the apparently plain statement of the Old Testament itself, and those who have not the patience, or even the inclination, to consider critical methods are sometimes apt to jump at conclusions which are creditable neither to their own sense of impartiality nor to Biblical scholars. Hence, it is scarcely surprising, when uncomplimentary estimates are held by men whose training has ostensibly fitted them to speak *ex cathedrâ*, that many will be more content to rely upon the judgment of those authorities than to endeavour to form an independent opinion for themselves.

The modern criticism of the Old Testament did not owe its origin to anti-semitism or to the Inquisition, as Dr. Reich has vainly argued, but rather to the Reformation and to the general development of thought that followed it. The new desire to understand ancient history intelligently, the curiosity of man to study himself and the records of his early days, combined with a freer though not less reverent study of the Bible itself, were the factors that set in motion the work of criticism. The study of history, like history-writing itself, was of slow growth, and many were the steps to be trodden before the study could make progress. Hebrew scholarship had to sever its dependence upon Jewish exegesis and probe for itself. Long ago one argued hotly over the antiquity of the Hebrew vowel-points, then it became a question of the consonantal text.

Formerly, one relied upon translations, now linguistic research seeks to determine the original text, to decide where the translation can be improved and where it must remain obscure. The text of the Old Testament has been traced back beyond the oldest MSS. (all relatively modern) to the early centuries of this era, and is found to have remained practically unchanged for nearly 1,800 years. At an earlier stage there were other recensions; the evidence of ancient versions, contemporary writings (e.g. the Book of Jubilees), and the Nash papyrus in the University Library at Cambridge prove this. Hence the text which was selected by the Jews many centuries ago must be studied in its relation to the evidence of other texts, so far as they can be recovered; the pursuit is intricate but instructive, and if it be "legitimate," the legitimacy of literary criticism at once follows. The historian, at all events, is inevitably obliged to take into account the existence of these other recensions, and to recognize that, before the Christian era, there was historical material which contains important differences from the accepted text.

To the theologian, the question of the Canon now arises; and since he owes it to the Jewish Synagogue, it is necessary for him to inquire whether it was necessarily infallible. For the historian it would be an arbitrary procedure to confine his criticism to those writings which were *not* included in the Canon. It is his duty to use all the available sources to obtain an idea of the land and people in whose midst these writings took their birth. With this object no subsidiary subject can be ignored; the bearings of comparative history, archaeology, sociology, etc., must be steadily kept in view in order to make the Old Testament a living record, and not a dead letter from the past. By systematic study he endeavours to ascertain the internal characteristics of the documents; and if duplicate narratives,

inconsistencies or contradictions prove the hand of compilers in the Old Testament, this is precisely the experience of those who handle the non-canonical writings,¹ and, as Oriental students find, is a familiar trait of those whose methods of composition were not the same as ours. A thorough acquaintance with the general trend of the history and religion of Israel combined with renewed investigation of the literary features shows that in the course of compilation passages of different ages, with different standpoints, have been brought together. Again, when the Book of Chronicles is compared with the Books of Samuel and Kings, it is impossible not to recognize the growth in religious ideas and the different conceptions of history-writing at different periods. The Book of Jubilees is not in the Jewish Canon, but it is no less valuable for the light it sheds upon later developments. In the writings of the Talmud one perceives that the work of evolution has not ceased, and thus one obtains a clear conception of the state of thought at certain definite periods. Impartial study leads to the conclusion that writers represent people or events in accordance with the particular standpoint of their age, and the historian is bound to take notice of this phase.

It has been found that two distinct accounts are given of Saul's election as king; they cannot be reconciled as they stand, and one of them bears the clearest traces of religious views which presuppose a lengthy existence of a monarchy. It is no more than "systematic common-

¹ For example, the problems which are raised by a critical examination of the Ascension of Isaiah presuppose a compilation from three distinct works, and practically all scholars who have investigated the book have been forced to recognize a plurality of authorship. It is noteworthy that the present complicated arrangement of the contents, contrary to chronology, and with many internal inconsistencies, passed unchanged until a Greek writer took it in hand and attempted to reduce it to order (Prof. R. H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xxxix. sq.). The Oriental mind, it has been observed, has not the Aryan habits of precision.

sense" which *forces* the historian to prefer the earlier one, which proves to be naturally adapted to the history of the period, whilst the later becomes a valuable document for his conception of thought after Israel had had a sad experience of royalty. Or again, the Old Testament presents three distinct types of David: the valiant warrior and king of the Books of Samuel, the founder of the ritual of Jerusalem in Chronicles, and the religious poet of the superscriptions of the Psalms. There are points of contact, but it is impossible to view them as different aspects of the same character, nor can the three be united in our conception of the David of history. To maintain the hypothesis of the three types would be, as Kuenen says, "a psychological absurdity," and psychological considerations must have weight. Criticism, however, finds the key to the problem in the "ever-increasing appreciation of his person and his work as the unifier of Israel," and can point to changes in the religious convictions of Israel which correspond to the changes in the development of the ancient tradition.¹

As a result of critical study a number of conclusions have been reached concerning which the opinion of critics is unanimous, and without these results an *intelligent* conception of the history of Israel is impossible. No doubt there have been some who have taken critical views at second-hand and have come to the conclusion that the study is futile and "bankrupt," but there are many more who have

¹ Where the historical critic is unable to institute a comparison with earlier narratives, but has only relatively late records, there is some room for subjectivity, and his conclusions must be based upon the historical continuity of the particular period, and a variety of other considerations. Naturally, accuracy in personal names, topography, local colouring and the like, are not enough by themselves to prove the historicity of a narrative; and although this would be freely admitted in the case of (say) the Book of Judith, the impartial critic will not refuse to apply the principle to a *canonical* work (e.g. Esther, Daniel).

reached critical opinions only with the greatest reluctance, after having fully satisfied themselves that these and the methods by which they are obtained are sound. This fact sometimes appears to be overlooked by those who are opposed to criticism. It must be admitted that there are many tentative judgments attaching to issues of greater or less importance which have not stood the test of time ; and though they may stimulate inquiry in special directions, it seems very certain (from recent controversy) that they are injurious in so far as they are apt to be pilloried as characteristic specimens of Old Testament criticism in general. But one may confidently assert that a view which marks any advance upon the "average opinion" meets with no more rigorous or searching criticism than among Bible critics themselves, and whatever general advance the future may witness will be based entirely upon the general progress of human knowledge.

To overthrow the results of criticism it would be necessary to prove that the Old Testament originated in a manner which finds no parallel in the literature of the ancient Orient ; that the ordinary methods of research which are habitually applied to other historical studies are ineligible when the Old Testament is concerned ; and that the cumulative evidence from the whole of the Old Testament (and not from one portion only) cannot stand before the cumulative evidence from the departments of comparative religion, anthropology or archaeology. Quite apart from theological questions, the Old Testament is a unique mine for the student of ancient thought, and those who are opposed to its criticism should consider on what grounds the scientific and comprehensive methods which are usually employed in other branches of research should be withheld in this one particular instance.

Now, it is a not uncommon belief that archaeology has

destroyed literary criticism and its results, that the spade has overthrown the critics' house of cards, that the archaeological method is objective, resting upon a basis of verifiable facts, whilst literary criticism is subjective, resting on the unsupported and unsupportable assumptions of modern scholars; and, finally, that the only test of the truthfulness of ancient history which is scientifically acceptable is that of contemporaneous evidence. Such statements on examination prove to originate in an ignorance of the history and the methods of criticism, from an insufficient acquaintance with archaeological evidence, or from incorrect or illogical inferences from the facts.¹ In many cases they are made with unjustifiable dogmatism, and are clothed in suitable technical terminology; thus they purport to be entirely conclusive, and consequently often prove irresistible to those who do not look much below the surface. Further, it is singularly noteworthy that those who are the first to condemn the methodical study of the Old Testament are often most prone to employ a system of haphazard and arbitrary criticism of their own without discrimination, or even depth of learning.

It must be perfectly plain that scientific research compels us to modify the familiar views which have so long been held regarding the early chapters in Genesis. Archaeological discoveries, in their turn, have proved that the same chapters are not trustworthy *historical* records. If the permanent value of the Old Testament has not been impaired by the light of science and archaeology upon Genesis i.-xi., there is little reason to fear the results of

¹ This has been rightly pointed out by Prof. Driver in his essay on "Hebrew Authority" in Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 143 sqq.; by Dr. G. B. Gray, in his criticism of Prof. Sayce's *Early History of the Hebrews*, in the *Expositor*, May, 1898; and by Prof. A. A. Bevan in his criticism of the same production in the *Critical Review*, 1898, pp. 131-135.

criticism. It must be recognized that *some* criticism is demanded by the facts. The familiar view that the Khabiri of the fifteenth century B.C. were the Israelites ignores the testimony of Exodus; the equally prevalent identification of Khammurabi of Babylon with Amraphel the contemporary of Abraham does violence to the chronology of Genesis, and those who believe that the Purusati of the Egyptian monuments were the Philistines must explain the appearance of this people in the days of Isaac. It is easy to strike out arbitrarily here or there, but the critical "theory" had assigned the chronology of Genesis to the post-exilic age independently of the evidence of archaeology, and Genesis xxvi. had been ascribed in its present form to about the eighth century before the archaeologists had renewed their interest in the Philistines. No single archaeological view of the Exodus of the Israelites does justice to the literary traditions preserved in the Bible, although by arbitrary selection of the data and by plausible reasoning *a* route may be confidently discovered. But the anarchy of criticism which archaeological writers often favour is futile; and the anxiety to maintain certain traditional standpoints (sometimes of no essential importance) leads to the perpetration of—as Wellhausen has said—"a number of heresies by way of gratification."¹ By fallacious argument, by confusion of fact and tradition, of truth and deduction, much harm can be and has been done in the name of archaeology; and the halo around the evidence of contemporary monuments and the "tangible" objects unearthed by the spade has frequently led unthinking minds to the conviction that the peculiar construction which has been placed upon them is as real as the precious objects themselves.

¹ Compare Prof. Bevan's remarks upon the attempts of apologists to reconcile the results of the criticism of Daniel with orthodoxy (*Daniel*, p. 7 seq.).

No one denies the importance of archaeology in Old Testament study; and if the welcome extended to it has sometimes been tardy, the explanation must be sought in the fact that the critical method requires that its evidence should be reliable. But archaeology is of all studies one of the most recent to be pursued scientifically; it has had to contend with enormous difficulties, its progress has been slow, and in its earlier stages, at least, there was necessarily an absence of finality in its conclusions. To rely implicitly upon the interpretation of inscriptions would have been rash; and until knowledge of pottery and forms of art had advanced, it would have been precarious to set archaeological theory above the evidence of the literary documents. Hence Biblical criticism, without neglecting the provisional results of archaeology in the past, has pursued its way independently, and constantly checking its conclusions in the light of external evidence has not found itself obliged to modify anything of importance.

It must be remembered that even archaeological and monumental facts are based partly upon the results of cumulative evidence and partly upon the literary criticism of monuments themselves, and in this and in other respects there is a similarity of method between Biblical and archaeological research. There is nothing esoteric about the study; neither the archaeologist nor the Biblical critic lays claim to secret knowledge to which he alone has access. Herein lies the root of the not infrequent objection to Biblical criticism when opponents protest that they fail to see in the Old Testament the evidence upon which the critics base their views, although they will readily grant that archaeological research requires a special training of its own. It is self-evident that no one who has not made the necessary preliminary study is in a position to estimate correctly the true significance of unearthed objects, or of a

half-excavated site ; and if this requires a trained eye, why should it be doubted that historical study is something deeper than the mere reading of documents ? It is true that strong religious convictions and presuppositions are not conducive to the impartial investigation of history ; but the contempt which has sometimes been poured upon the critic's discovery of novelties in records which have been in the hands of everyone for ages is as generous as to ridicule that science which treats of the constitution and structure of the earth's crust, and to ignore the fact that the spirit of scientific investigation is of modern growth and that nowhere are the data so complicated as in the study of human thought. And it follows from this that if the literary critic is incompetent to express an opinion upon archaeological facts unless he possess the necessary knowledge, the archaeologist or expert in another branch of research who resorts to literary evidence is not *de facto* gifted with historical judgment. Perhaps an honest recognition of this would remove the mutual suspicion between archaeology and Old Testament criticism, which, so far as the latter is concerned, is extended, not to facts and undisputed evidence, but to the deductions and inferences sometimes based upon them. It is to be added also that whilst there are unfortunately only comparatively few trained archaeologists, the number of Biblical critics is not inconsiderable ; and whilst it seems only reasonable that a certain amount of weight should be laid upon the unanimity of the latter in the leading issues, there is no little divergence of opinion among the former in the important matters of Biblical interest. Hence, although one is anxious to express one's appreciation of the work of archaeological experts, it is only natural that the critic should make a mental reservation in those cases where he finds that the expert has little or no support among his colleagues. This elementary principle is fre-

quently overlooked, with the result that the inferences of one isolated archaeologist will obtain more credence than the unanimous view of literary critics of all sects and schools simply because there has been a failure to perceive that there is no logical connexion between reliable facts and unreliable inferences.

The scepticism of archaeologists towards literary criticism is due chiefly, perhaps, to a failure to appreciate the methods of historical criticism. The nature of literary evidence *per se*, however, is fully admitted. Professor Sayce, himself a champion of archaeology *versus* literary criticism, has observed, "as every one knows who has studied the historical books of the Old Testament, the position of a narrative is no indication of its right chronological place; the compiler, in arranging his material, never scrupled to subordinate chronological to other considerations."¹ Although Professor Sayce may not hold this opinion to-day, the evidence upon which it is based remains the same and presents the same complexity. His attitude in recent years has been to deny the possibility of analysing a composite source. But to base objections upon the limitations of one's personal knowledge or ability is not argument, and Professor Sayce exemplifies his absolute failure to understand the subject he criticizes when he challenges Englishmen to distinguish the several portions of the composite labours of a Besant and Rice. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the two cases are not parallel, and that it is from the fact that the Pentateuch contains the marks of different styles, separate representations and the like, that criticism has been able to make progress.

The so-called "proofs" which Professor Sayce has been

¹ *Modern Review*, Jan. 1884, pp. 158 sqq.; cf. his *Monuments*, pp. 31, 34; *Hist. of Heb.* 129; *Mon. Facts*, 45. See also Prof. Petrie, *Methods and Aims in Archaeology*, p. 138.

accustomed to adduce (for many years past) are singularly wide of the mark. Again and again he proclaims to the world the antiquity of writing, as though the work of the literary or historical critic were nullified by his discovery. His assertion that literary (and consequently historical) criticism is based upon an assumption which denies the antiquity of writing is so baseless that it would deserve contemptuous silence were it not so repeatedly stated. To point to indubitable ancient monuments as a proof that "the critical theory crumbles into dust" is fallacious, for Biblical criticism has never proceeded upon the assumption in question, and it is illogical to suppose that the fact that writing was known in the time of Moses proves that he wrote the books which Hebrew tradition has ascribed to him. This confusion of "monumental facts and fancies" defies logic and ignores the repeated denial and repudiation of critics, and one can only find comfort in the thought that the insistent popularization of misstatements and misrepresentations, like criticism itself, can never destroy the truth.

Professor Sayce has very truly observed, on one occasion, that it is impossible to "understand the literature of the Orient aright without becoming Orientals ourselves, or interpret the history of the past without divesting ourselves as it were of modern dress." The reproduction in oneself of the intuitions of the past by throwing oneself back into antiquity, which Littré demanded and Renan claimed, is naturally indispensable; but Professor Sayce has the knack of failing to recognize the natural concomitants of his principles, since, as Littré has insisted, it is equally indispensable that the "spirit should remain modern." Without the "modern spirit" it is impossible to understand the different types of David or the numerous instances of varying traditions, whilst it is only by "becoming Orientals ourselves" that we appreciate their significance and can read

them in the light in which they appealed to contemporaries. In point of fact, an acquaintance with Oriental methods fully justifies critical results; and it is hardly necessary to add that the archaeologist must inevitably display the "modern spirit" when he determines the historical value of Egyptian papyri, or finds the same "tendency writing" which, when the Old Testament is in question, raises protests.¹ Accordingly, when Professor Sayce complains that the Old Testament is criticized as though it were the production of a modern European, he is really objecting to the application of principles of modern research employed by all historians and even by archaeologists.

As an interesting example of archaeological *versus* critical argument, the much debated question of the patriarchal period may be selected. The Hebrew tradition that the Hittites were in Canaan in Abraham's day seems to find support in Professor Sayce's argument from Egyptian evidence that the Pharaohs were destroying the "palaces of the Hittites" at the beginning of the twelfth dynasty, and in his statement that "archaeology has shown that the painted pottery discovered in the earlier strata of Lachish and Gezer had its original home in Northern Cappadocia, and is an enduring evidence of Hittite culture and trade."² On the Babylonian evidence, the record in Genesis xxiii. has been regarded as a faithful picture of Babylonian commercial transactions such as only existed "in the Abrahamic age," and what capital has been made of the testimony of the monuments to the accuracy of the great invasion in Genesis xiv. is only too well known. Considering that Biblical critics still maintain that the Hebrew narratives in their present form are several centuries later,

¹ An extremely interesting example is given by Professor Petrie in his *History of Egypt*, ii. p. 69 seq.

² *Contemporary Review*, August 1905, p. 274; cf. *Biblical World*, xxvi. p. 30.

it would be perhaps scarcely astonishing if some people were content to reject the claims of Biblical criticism without subjecting the arguments on one side or the other to an impartial scrutiny.

Now, the critics do not deny that a document may contain historical material centuries older than its present setting, and should excavation unearth a cuneiform record¹ containing the above, the critical position would not be endangered. The present internal peculiarities which critics have observed would not be removed by this interesting discovery if it consisted merely of a cuneiform original of existing documents. Robertson Smith, whose qualifications to pronounce upon Oriental custom are undeniable, has stated that "if we accept the picture presented in Genesis literally, it displays a miraculous life"; for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to have wandered as aliens from their own kin without becoming the protected dependents of another kin "is a standing miracle, and on this miracle everything else in the history of Genesis depends." Can cuneiform tablets be expected to remove this, when the very Amarna Letters themselves have proved that in the fifteenth century, at least, Palestine was in a state of internal confusion in which there is no room for the quiet and peace-loving patriarchs? And when one considers the archaeological arguments, it appears that the translation of the Egyptian inscription is unsound (so Professor Breasted); and the evidence from the pottery is extremely precarious, partly because one could infer in the same way the presence of Baltic tribes in Egypt from the amber that has been found there, and partly because the ware has not

¹ See Dr. Reich in the *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1906; and for his confident anticipation in the near future of "a copy of Genesis in cuneiform script, dating from the thirteenth or twelfth century, B.C.," see *Failure of the Higher Criticism*, p. 186.

been proved to be specifically Hittite.¹ The evidence from Babylonian contracts has more than once been shown to have no bearing upon the Biblical narrative of the sale of the cave of Machpelah, and expert Assyriological opinion points out that there are noteworthy differences between the two usages. Finally, as regards Genesis xiv., no conceivable discovery can remove the inherent difficulties of the existing narrative upon which critics have based their views; no external evidence has yet been found in support of its genuineness, and the statements to the contrary ignore the more recent testimony from Assyriology itself.²

It is not difficult to perceive occasionally a reluctance to admit that Biblical narratives contain internal difficulties, and by contesting this or that theory which has been framed to explain them it is believed that Biblical criticism has been overthrown. The conclusion that very many of the laws of Moses are post-Mosaic rests upon archaeological and sociological grounds, upon historical considerations, upon a careful study of the whole of the Old Testament, upon the development of law and custom (continued outside the Canon)—in a word, upon a mass of cumulative material which it is impossible to withstand. There can be no doubt that the discovery of Khammurabi's laws (circ. 2250 B.C.), with their remarkable parallels to the Mosaic legislation, is a shock to the traditional view of Moses;

¹ *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, 1905, p. 153 sqq. The whole question of pottery-dates, based as it is upon a variety of cumulative evidence of varying value, finds an interesting analogy in literary criticism.

² It would have been interesting to sketch briefly the true history of the treatment of Gen. xiv.; but reference may be made to Professor Driver in Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 39-45, his *Genesis*, pp. 156 sqq., 171 sqq., to Professor Bevan, *Critical Review*, 1897, p. 410 seq., and to Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, chap. xiv. seq. The misrepresentation of Professor Nöldeke's views which Professor Sayce has permitted himself (*Monumental Facts*, p. 54 seq.) is exceedingly unjust: to ascribe to a scholar views which he had expressly repudiated is most unsportsmanlike.

and it is scarcely credible that Professor Sayce could regard it as a weapon against criticism and should offer an extraordinary compromise of the tradition in the new light in a way that defies the laws of sociology and the internal evidence of the Mosaic code itself. But his *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* unfortunately abounds in colossal misrepresentation and fallacious argument, and his attacks upon literary criticism are utterly inconsistent with his own methods of historical criticism, which are extremely "advanced" and not rarely excessively rash.¹

For sound historical criticism, the evidence of the Old Testament, and that from Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt or Arabia must each be viewed independently in the first instance. For example, the Biblical account of Sennacherib's invasion in B.C. 701 presents certain internal difficulties upon which the records of Assyria and Egypt may be expected to throw light. Several intricate questions are involved and Biblical critics are obliged to appeal to the special experts of these lands. Egyptologists are divided as regards the possibility that Tirhakah was king of Egypt at that date, whilst several Assyriologists admit the possibility that Sennacherib invaded Palestine a second time after 701. If the latter could be proved, the critic would be able to explain certain features in the Biblical

¹ The statement that the Babylonian code "has shattered the critical 'theory' [an *informed* writer would say 'conclusion'] which would put the Prophets before the Law" and similar pronouncements, put forth with all the authority of an archaeologist, have perhaps found credence here and there in spite of their fundamental inaccuracy, but the hopelessness of arguing a lost case has rarely been more vividly illustrated. (His recent *réchauffé*, "Archaeology and Criticism" in *Essays for the Times*, No. vi., claims to give the result of a "scientific" comparison between the *facts* of archaeology and the *assumptions* of literary criticism. It contains his familiar misconceptions and illogical inferences and exemplifies more clearly than ever the writer's isolated position among Biblical scholars.)

narrative which cannot be reconciled in a natural manner with the events of 701, and the allusion to Tirhakah would become more intelligible. But when Professor Petrie, in his *History of Egypt* (p. 296), endeavours to show that Tirhakah was acting as king in 701, and then states that "there is no need whatever to resort to a theory of two campaigns," it is evident that our Egyptological expert has not advanced the problem one whit. The Assyriological possibility still remains, the Biblical narrative continues to be difficult, and one is obliged to recognize that other leading Egyptologists regard the chronology of the period differently.

As another specimen of cross-purposes we may take the Biblical account of the invasion of Zerah the Cushite in the time of Asa. It appears only in the Book of Chronicles, and records the destruction of one million men in order to show that the Lord will give victory to those who trust in Him, and that mere numbers cannot prevail against those who rely upon His aid and do not seek foreign alliances. The parallel but earlier records in the Book of Kings do not mention the event, but it would be rash to reject it for this reason alone: the *argumentum e silentio* is a dangerous weapon, whether it is used to cast doubt upon a statement, or in order to maintain the traditional view that the Mosaic law was observed throughout the period of the judges and the kings.¹ Now, since it is known that when Israel came against Judah, Asa bribed the king of Syria to create a diversion, the historical connexion does not favour the Chronicler's story of this overwhelming victory. But many of the much-abused "destructive" critics have refused to treat it as an invention and have observed that

¹ The mere silence of an authority is no guide by itself; several considerations require to be carefully weighed; see Professor Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899), pp. 101 sqq.

Cush does not always refer to Ethiopia, but is also the name of certain Arabian tribes, including the Sabeans (Gen. x. 7); and, indeed, Cushites and Arabians are mentioned as neighbours in 2 Chronicles xxi. 16. Hordes from north Arabia frequently troubled Palestine, and the very name Zerah has found its equivalent in old Arabian inscriptions. Hence the moderate critical estimate may be summed up in the words of Professor Barnes: "If by Zerah the Ethiopian a Sabean prince be meant, the only real difficulty of the narrative is removed."¹ For many years attempts were made to identify Zerah with the Egyptian Uasarkon I. or II. of whom the latter has a vague reference to the subjugation of Palestine. But the manifold difficulties have led to its rejection by practically all scholars. Notwithstanding this, Professor Petrie, in the book referred to, harks back to the identification with Uasarkon I., glides over the fact that Egyptian names could be faithfully reproduced in Hebrew (or were perverted in such a way that their un-Semitic origin was obvious), "stiffens" the difficult Biblical chronology to agree with the equally difficult Egyptian data, and supports his view by a kind of argument that would prove the genuineness of the legends of King Arthur or of the early days of Rome. By a contemptuous reference to the theory of an "unrecorded person of a dubious Cush in North Arabia," it would seem that this is to be regarded as archaeological proof of the genuineness of the Chronicler's record, and of the untrustworthiness of critical theory, the Arabian Cush apparently being attributed to the lively imagination of the critics! And unfortunately tradition is soon deprived of its ally; for, instead of reconciling the "Ethiopian" Zerah with the usual

¹ *Cambridge Bible : Chronicles*, p. xxxi. The numbers of the troops (e.g. 540,000 from Judah and Benjamin!) are obviously unreliable, but it is the *possibility* of such an invasion which is conceded, and not the Chronicler's representation of it.

Libyan origin of Uasarkon's dynasty, the writer tells us that the dynastic names point to a Babylonian or Persian origin, since Sheshenk (Shishak) is "man of Shushan" or Susa, and Uasarkon's name is from the great Sargon. Biblical history and its difficulties could scarcely be handled in a less scientific manner.¹

It is hardly necessary to multiply further examples of methods which have all the appearance of being based upon mistaken ideas of orthodoxy or tradition, and certainly labour under a misapprehension of the work of Biblical criticism. Since there is every reason to believe that the future of archaeological research will be as prolific as its past, it is not a cheering outlook if, as evidence accumulates, the time-worn arguments and objections, without the novelty of freshness or the sincerity of impartiality, are hurled anew against critical work. There will always be those whose aim it will be to pursue the study further with the help of the new knowledge; and unless the rights of criticism are acknowledged, the breach between the critical and traditional positions may become wider. Kuenen, in his unfortunately much neglected essay, to which we have more than once referred, observes that "many of the reproaches, apparently well founded, which have been cast

¹ Professor Petrie's treatment of Shabaka, so far as Biblical history is concerned, is equally inconclusive, and does not advance the question, despite his dogmatic insistence upon "facts" (p. 283). A narrative and its statements are not "facts" until they have been proved to be authentic in a natural manner. Contemporary records, particularly such "tangible" evidence as monuments and inscriptions, obviously stand upon an entirely different footing, but even these must be subjected to criticism; for example, the list of Palestinian towns conquered by Tirhakah is of little value, since it is a mere copy of an earlier list (Petrie, p. 297). Professor Petrie appears to confuse the *representation* of the past with what actually took place, regardless of the circumstance that even early historians and writers were often under the influence of recognizable tendencies.

in ancient and modern times against the saints of Israel, fall away as soon as the narratives concerning them are cast into the crucible of criticism." The present article has not concerned itself with this aspect of the question, but one has sometimes heard the opinion that those who condemn criticism can scarcely be aware that they would remove one of the strongest weapons with which the bitter and often shrewd attacks upon the Bible by freethinkers or atheists can be repulsed.

To sum up: the criticism of the Old Testament is the comprehensive study of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge, conducted upon the same lines as all other studies which depend upon written sources. It is demanded by the requirements of modern research in order to render the Bible intelligible to modern needs—the needs not merely of the theologian, but of the historian and of all students of primitive thought. It has silenced scoffers, and relieved the perplexities of those who were unable to reconcile many of the Biblical statements with their conscience. It has justified itself in a variety of ways: in the character of its numerous adherents, in the agreement of independent testimony, and in the impossibility otherwise of using Biblical evidence in scientific research. Archaeology has so far supported it, and by mutual co-operation the progress of both may be furthered. *But*, the criticism of the Old Testament has frequently been condemned and misrepresented; it has been attacked by arguments which have been answered repeatedly in the last five and twenty years, and no small responsibility must rest upon those who, by means of unsupportable or erroneous statements, or by conscious or unconscious obscurantism, influence the opinion of others less capable than themselves of judging its merits.

STANLEY A. COOK.

DERBE.

THE intention of this paper is to set down on the spot, while the impressions are fresh, the ideas suggested by a renewed examination of the territory of Derbe. Along with my wife (to whose observation and quick eye for several classes of facts I am, as often elsewhere, deeply indebted in the present article) I have just traversed the land of Derbe on fresh lines, and have thus been able to complete the knowledge which I had gained before from exploration and from long pondering over the questions and difficulties involved. We started from the Bagdad Railway, near the north-western limit of the territory of Derbe, and zigzagged first southwards and then westwards during two days, May 1 and 2; and I cannot see any other line of work that promises to reveal further knowledge, until excavation can be called in to complete the results which can be gained by simple travel.

The determination of the exact site of Derbe was one of the most serious wants in the geography of the New Testament. In a general way the situation was practically certain, and the credit for first pointing it out belongs to my friend Professor Sterrett, now of Cornell University, who has done so much to pave the way towards a right knowledge of the topography of this whole country. The territory of all these Lycaonian cities was extensive, and must have been dotted over with villages, which stood in the same relation to the city as we have recently described in the case of Iconium.¹ The territory of Derbe was on the extreme south-eastern edge of the Lycaonian plain. It was bounded on the west by the Isaurian hilly country, and on the south by the Taurus mountains. Perhaps it included a considerable tract of the mountain land; but

¹ EXPOSITOR, October, 1905.

so far as we saw the mountains in ascending one of the front hills of a spur of Taurus, they are singularly rough, rocky, and valueless—in contrast with many parts of Taurus and other mountain regions of Asia Minor, where the glens are often productive and valuable. Further back among the mountains, when the broad, lofty plateau of Taurus is reached, these uplands are probably much more valuable; but there we come to another land, and pass beyond the limits of Derbe, which was essentially a city of the Lycaonian plain (as Strabo describes it), and not of the Taurus mountain-region. The site of the city must lie either in the plain or on one of the front peaks of Taurus commanding the plain.

On the east the land of Derbe was bound by the two Lycaonian cities of Laranda (which now bears the name of the Seljuk prince Karaman, and continues to be, as it was under the Romans, the principal city of the whole region), and Ilistra (which still retains its ancient name). On the west, as Strabo says, Derbe bordered on the Isaurian country; on the north-west it touched the territory of Iconium, and on the north-east that of Barata, the city of the Black Mountain (the volcanic mass of Kara-Dagh, which rises like an island in the Lycaonian plain). The exact limits towards Iconium are unknown. Towards Barata we followed the boundary stones for a considerable distance. This line of demarcation is unique in my experience, so far as its extent is concerned: single boundary stones are not very rare, and are mostly of Roman time. It consists of a long series of stones at intervals of about 150 feet.¹ Most of the stones are from one to two feet high,

¹ I paced a number of the intervals successively, as follows: 130, 137, 140, 67, 68, 140, 66, 134, 69, 67, 73, 60, 65, 68, 62. The five larger measures are where intermediate stones have been lost or hidden from view. The intervals, therefore, vary from 60 paces to 73; and the stones must have been placed roughly according to eye-sight, and not by measurement. I

some are flat, a few are not visible, being presumably covered by the soil and sparse scrub of the plain.¹ On the stoneless, dry, dead level soil of the plain, the line of the boundary-stones is quite conspicuous; and even where they now barely protrude above the soil, examination by the aid of the spade would doubtless prove that they have been carried to the spot and placed there by the hand of man.

A few stones belonging to a similar series of termini was discovered by us in 1901 in Pisidia. The material is harder in them, and they retain the original Latin numbers, showing that they were placed in the Roman time. They probably marked the boundary between the Colonia Parlais and the Antiochian estates, which passed from the god to the kings and from them into the possession of Augustus and his successors. These stones have been described and published by my friend the Rev. H. S. Cronin in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902.²

The Lycaonian line of stones marks the limit between Derbe and Barata, and was probably placed in the period when Derbe was a frontier city of the Roman Empire, while Barata was part of the territory either of King Archelaus, or later of King Antiochus, i.e. either under Augustus soon after 25 B.C., or under Claudius soon after 41 B.C. (assuming that the bounds were settled at the beginning of one or other of the two periods); and the latter is more probable, as Claudius directed special attention to this district and granted both to Iconium and to Derbe the honourable

paced the short interval 60 twice, and measured it with the tape-line, 148 feet.

¹ Probably most of them might, with care, be traced. The lost stones occur mostly near the point where I began to pace the distances, when I was on the outlook only for taller stones.

² On the topography, however, it is necessary to consult my paper in the *Annual of the British School at Athens*, 1902, on "Pisidia and the Lycaonian Frontier."

title of "Claudian." The title may have perhaps been bestowed when the demarcation of Roman territory (with Imperial properties involved) as well as of the two cities was made.

The boundary line crosses the Bagdad Railway between the stations of Arik-Euren and Mandasun. Only a few stones can be seen west of the Railway ; but on the eastern side they stretch for several miles straight to a black volcanic cone called Davdha-Dagh, which protrudes from the plain south of Kara-Dagh. We did not follow them the whole way, as no mark of any kind could be seen on any of the first seventy ; and the material is so poor and liable to disintegration that marks could not be expected to last long. Mr. Mackensen, the Director of Construction of the Bagdad Railway, first mentioned to me the existence of this line of stones, for which he desired an explanation ; and he made one of his engineers mark them on a survey-plan of the Railway from Konia onwards, which he kindly gave me. But even without the plan, no traveller who crossed the boundary could have failed to observe the long straight line of stones. The fact that it remained unobserved until Mr. Mackensen noticed the stones and wished to understand their purpose, was because none of the principal lines of road crosses or goes near the line, and therefore no traveller came within sight of them. This is not the only case in which the Railway, by diverging from the commonly used lines of road, has brought interesting memorials of ancient life within the range of knowledge. Any one now, who travels by the Bagdad Railway, must be struck with this boundary line, if he looks out of the carriage, instead of devoting his attention to a guide-book or a novel.

The thin low scrub which covers the plain is characteristic of Lycaonia generally. Looking from a little distance, one

might imagine that the ground was thinly covered with grass ; but there is in reality hardly anywhere a blade of grass on the plain, but only low-growing plants of several kinds, mostly sweet-smelling, the commonest of which is like thyme. Sheep and goats find good food in these shrubs ; and the plain is still traversed by immense flocks of sheep and goats, as Strabo describes it, when it gave pasture to the great flocks owned by Amyntas, the last king of Galatia. We must understand that the flocks passed, with the rest of his inheritance, to the Roman Emperors and formed part of their vast properties in Asia Minor.

The most striking natural feature of the land of Derbe is the lofty conical peak, 8,000 feet or more in height, and snow-clad until the end of May or June, which overhangs it on the south. This beautiful mountain is conspicuous in the view from Iconium and most parts of Lycaonia, until one crosses Boz-Dagh and gets into northern Lycaonia ; and, if one goes far enough north, it again rises into view above the bare, bald ridge of Boz-Dagh. It is called Hadji-Baba, "Pilgrim Father," a name in which the imagination of some of the modern Greeks in Lycaonia finds a reminiscence of the travels of St. Paul ; nor can any one regard as wholly impossible the theory that the Turkish name is a translation of a Pauline name attached to the mountain in the Christian time. We remember that the conical peak, about 5,500 feet high, which is the most striking natural feature beside Iconium, bears among the Greeks of Konia the name of St. Philip, and that this name must be regarded as a relic of Byzantine nomenclature,¹ and may fairly be treated as evidence that Iconian tradition made Philip travel from Palestine to Hierapolis and Ephesus

¹ Konia and the neighbouring village Sille have preserved a continuous Greek population, and continuity in the tradition may therefore be expected, and can almost certainly be traced in the church of St. Amphilocheus and the monastery of St. Chariton, etc.

by land and not by sea. We remember also that Ephesus stretched from the hill of St. John to the hill of St. Paul.¹ We remember, again, the probable reminiscence of the journey of St. Paul across Pisidia contained in the modern name Bavlo. In fact, it needs no proof, since many examples are known, that there was a tendency in Anatolia to regard certain prominent peaks as endowed with something of the nature and personality of the Apostles, over whose travels they had stood as silent witnesses. Probably, the sacred character thus attributed to these peaks had belonged to them long before the Christian period, and the Apostle in each case merely took the place of an older deity to whom the peak had previously been consecrated : so, for example, the hill of St. John at Ephesus had belonged to the goddess of Ephesus, the hill of St. Paul to Hermes. We are in presence of the same phenomenon which constantly attracts our attention in Asia Minor, viz., the continuity of religious belief and the permanent attachment of religious awe to special localities, to hills, to hot springs, to great fountains, and to other places of various kinds, where the divine power was most clearly manifested to men.²

In the territory of Derbe remains of city life are chiefly collected along the southern border of the plain, and the site of the actual town must be looked for in this part. They begin on the east at Bossala Khan, under the shadow of the "Pilgrim Father," an early Turkish building with some wretched huts around it, and extend at intervals for about seven miles west, to a mound called Gudelisin. Losta, a village about two miles west of Bossala, contains a great many relics of the late Roman and early Byzantine time ; and several rising grounds between Bossala and

¹ See the chapter on "Ephesus" in *The Letters to the Seven Churches*.

² See two articles in the EXPOSITOR, June and August, 1905, on the Ephesian goddess.

Gudelisin are crowned with groups of scattered blocks of cut stone, sometimes covered with Greek inscriptions. The most interesting of these groups is on a sloping ridge, gently rising from the plain about a mile and a half west of Losta. Here there must have stood a church of very large size, and probably other buildings of early Byzantine time. The hillock may be regarded as the site of an ecclesiastical foundation, whose character is to be gathered from the following inscription:—

Nounnos	Νοῦννος
and Vale-	καὶ Οὐαλέ-
rius decor-	ριος ἐκόσ-
ated Pau-	μησαν Παῦ-
lus the Mar-	λον τὸν Μάρ-
tyr	τυραν
in remembrance	M. X.

The term “decorated” was used commonly in Lycaonia during the third and fourth centuries (perhaps even during a longer period) in the sense of “made the tomb of.” This interesting monument, therefore, marks the grave of a Christian martyr, whose body was piously honoured by two of his fellow-Christians, perhaps his pupils. The explanation given by the Greeks of the district¹—that the monument commemorates the Apostle Paul, and is a proof that he passed this way and was remembered here—cannot be accepted. We have here the inscription on a real grave, not on a cenotaph. Moreover, the monument belongs to so late a period that it cannot be connected with the Apostle. The lettering is of the third century, rather than of the first.²

This monument evidently belongs to the pre-Constantinian

¹ The few Greeks, who are met with in this neighbourhood, are all strangers engaged in trade. The Christian population of this part of Lycaonia was entirely exterminated or expelled after the Turkish conquest. There is, therefore, no continuity in the local tradition; and no one knows that Derbe was situated in the neighbourhood.

² There is no absolute impossibility that it might be of the second century; but, personally, I could not date it so early.

age, while Christianity was still proscribed. We should hardly be justified in dating it so late as the time of Diocletian, about A.D. 300, when persecution was so systematic and energetic that the corpse of a martyr could not have been taken and buried in the ordinary fashion, with a tombstone of the usual type, and an epitaph openly commemorating the facts and names. The incident belongs either to one of the minor persecutions of the third century, or to the severe but short persecution by the Emperor Decius A.D. 250. Several other monuments found in Phrygia have been interpreted with more or less certainty as placed over the graves of martyrs of this period ; but in none of them are the facts stated so plainly and simply as on this Lycaonian gravestone.

The memory of Paul the Martyr of Derbe had not perished when Christianity became legalized and supreme in the country ; and this incidentally confirms our dating in the third century, for martyrs of the first or second century seem rarely to have been remembered in later centuries as real personalities at the place of their burial. The hill became the seat of an ecclesiastical foundation, including a church of large size, and the pious would choose a burial place near the martyr, according to a general Christian custom.

The tombstone of Paul the Martyr has also an interest of another kind. It is ornamented with a pattern of the regular Isaurian type, described by Miss Ramsay in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904 : a central pointed pediment flanked by two round pediments, all supported on four columns.¹ Nounnos and Valerius purchased the tomb-

¹ The most ornate example of this type was republished in the *EXPOSITOR* early in 1905, in my article on *The Book as an early Christian Symbol*. No symbols or ornament other than architectural exist on the gravestone of Paul of Derbe.

stone ready-made, and had the inscription engraved between the central columns. As the letters required more room than the space afforded, the engraver chiselled away part of the column on the right of the central space, and some of the letters extend into the space under the right hand pediment.

The date which has just been assigned to this monument confirms in a most satisfactory way the principle of dating which was stated in Miss Ramsay's article. The origin of the Isaurian scheme of decoration was there assigned to the middle of the third century. As the tombstone of Paul is, plainly and indubitably, an example of an already current and conventional type, we should, on the principle there stated, be bound to infer that it belongs to a date rather later than 250, and that Paul perished in a minor persecution of the period, perhaps under Valerian. Such seems the most probable opinion on a review of all the facts.

The wide extent of the ancient remains that still lie in or close to their original position increases the difficulty of fixing the precise site of Derbe; and the only view that explains the facts seems to be that there were more sites than one. Either Derbe changed its place (as Ephesus was moved more than once¹), or there were two towns in the locality, with sepulchral monuments lining the way between them. The latter opinion is confirmed by various reasons, and the name of a second town can be determined. This was Possala or Passola,² which is mentioned as a bishopric in some documents of the fourth century, and later; and the name has remained to the present day in Bossala Khan. It is not necessary to suppose that the Khan stands exactly on the site of the old town. The Khan is on the direct

¹ Compare the chapter on Ephesus in the *Letters to the Seven Churches*.

² The chief facts about this name are gathered together in my paper on Lycaonia, in the Austrian *Jahreshefte*, 1904.

road from Iconium to Pyrgos (Cassaba) and Laranda, and the town stood a little way west from the road at Losta, which is plainly an ancient site ; but doubtless buildings and graves extended along the whole way, from Losta to the Khan and the great road, so that Losta and Bossala together represent one ancient town. Why the Khan should preserve the old name and the village should lose it, we cannot tell with certainty : it is one of those freaks of nomenclature which are common. The centre of population may have changed its name when its people and its religion changed, while the old name clung to the now separate village on the road, along which trade passed, and Christians were more active and old memories were stronger.

In Losta an old Turkish *Tekke*, a round edifice of religious nature, superior in architectural character and in sanctity to a mere village mosque, indicates the continuity of religion between the ancient Possala and the modern Losta. We notice all over the country that no religious fact was (as a rule) lost in the transition from Christianity to Mohammedanism in Asia Minor. I have seen many cases in which the only evidence of life and human nature still persisting on an otherwise utterly dead and deserted ancient site is the religious awe attaching to some ruinous old Turkish sacred building ; the name of some Mohammedan hero or saint is remembered, who lies buried there, for in Anatolian religion there seems always to have been a grave at the central point of the divinely chosen locality ; and the inquiring traveller can detect some signs of a belief in the healing divine power that resides at the sacred spot. At such places the Byzantine Christians used to worship by the grave of a saint, and the Turks now show the grave of one of their "Dedes." The outward appearance and the sacred name change ; the essential religious fact persists. Every ancient city had its religious unity centred at some

definite locality, and this lives on in the minds of men, and the sick and ailing remember it in their trouble, while the strong and healthy pass by without a sign of recognition.

Fully five miles west of Losta was the greatest centre of ancient life in this neighbourhood. Here at and around a very large mound, called Gudelisin, and chiefly on the low ground west of the mound, there are plain traces of an ancient city of moderate extent. Most of the Byzantine or early Turkish buildings which were seen on the mound by Professor Sterrett in 1885 and by us in 1890, and which are dimly visible in the photograph taken then by Mr. Hogarth (published in the *Church in the Roman Empire*), were destroyed to build refugees' villages, on the south-east side of the mound, and at a distance of two miles to the south-east, soon after 1890. Even the larger ancient cut stones have mostly been carried away. Few sites in the country are more utterly destroyed; but the surface is covered with fragments of pottery of all periods from quite an early time onwards.¹ In 1901 my wife and I searched carefully for any scrap of cut stone that might be attributed to the Greek or the early Roman period, and found only two, one a small piece of an Ionic volute in marble, the other a tiny fragment of an inscription with two or three letters in a good and early style. My friends Mr. Cronin and Mr. Wathen, in 1901 made some excavation in the mound with eight workmen employed for a day; but they were not fortunate in finding any positive result, and no negative inference follows from investigation on so small a scale. I feel no doubt that here was situated the Derbe where Antipater entertained Cicero and St. Paul found refuge and friends, and that much might be learned by excavation even on a moderate scale. The stones and inscriptions from

¹ A few specimens of the early pottery may be seen in the British Museum.

this site, which have been carried westwards to Elmasun three miles away, are Byzantine and late Roman ; and the Greek and early Roman work, still more the pre-Greek remains, may yet be found by excavation on and near the mound.

It may be regarded as certain that Derbe was the most important centre of population in the Roman period, while Possala was merely a village of the territory of Derbe. A Roman road led from Laranda by Derbe and Lystra to Pisidian Antioch. A Roman milestone on this road was found by us in 1890 at a bridge over Tcharshamba River, about fifteen miles north-west from Derbe and twenty or twenty-five south of Lystra. Others have been found close to Lystra, and at intervals on the way to Antiocheia. Only the interval of about twenty-five miles north-west of Lystra still remains unexamined and unknown.¹ The discovery of a milestone in this section would be a welcome completion to our knowledge. Iconium lay off the line of this road, which was built by Augustus and bore the name *Via Sebaste*, "Imperial Road," as several of the original milestones show ; this term was translated into Greek as *βασιλική ὁδός*, and in this form survives in the legend of Paul and Thekla.² The original purpose of the road was to connect the two Roman *Coloniae*, Antiocheia and Lystra, and thus to strengthen the defence of the Province Galatia against the Isaurian and Pisidian mountaineers, especially the *Homonades*. The road was built in 6 B.C., about the time when Quirinius, governor of Syria, was engaged in subduing that people.

The "Imperial Road" served only a temporary purpose, and was not in accordance with the natural conditions.

¹ A general account of it is given in my *Preliminary Report of a Journey in 1905*.

² See the *Church in the Roman Empire*, Part I.

Iconium is marked out by nature as the chief centre of life and trade for Lycaonia, and a road which left Iconium to one side could not serve the needs of communication. Thus the direct road from Laranda to Iconium was necessarily more important commercially than the "Imperial Road"; and, as military needs became unimportant after the mountain lands were pacified and formed into a Roman Province in 74 A.D., the situation of the village Possala near the principal road gave it growing importance. But Possala and Derbe were always recognized as parts of one state, never as separate cities. The same Bishop administered both places, and in the earlier records he is styled Bishop of Derbe, in the later of Possala.¹ The change marks the growth of the latter town and the gradual decay of Derbe. The relation between the two names is recorded in a gloss attached to the name in a list of bishoprics, published by Professor Gelzer; and some list or other record may yet be found, in which the full title is given: "Bishop of Derbe and Possala" (ὁ Δέρβης καὶ Ποσάλων).

Professor Sterrett's view approximated to that which has just been stated, and he has the merit of being the first to detect that this locality was the land of Derbe. In his *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, p. 22, he says: "I consider that the ruins of Bosola and Zosta,² being so near together, represent one and the same ancient city. This city I should like to call Derbe. Stephanus Byzantinus says Derbe was a fortress of Isauria, a designation which would suit this site well enough. Of course, little can be argued from St. Paul's itinerary as to the site of Derbe, but in reading the account, one is impressed with the idea that Derbe cannot be far from Lystra, and Lystra has been

¹ For particulars, and for the spelling of the name, see the Austrian *Jahreshefte*, *loc. cit.*

² Professor Sterrett uses here this form of the name; but I heard only Losta, and so also MM. Radet and Duvré.

found to be at Khatyn Gerai." The objections to his view are conclusive. Not merely does it leave out of consideration the important site of Gudelisin. It also ignores the companion town of Possala. Now, if Losta and Bossala represent one and the same ancient city, as my friend and I are agreed in thinking, it cannot be doubted that Possala was the city in question. As to Gudelisin, he merely says : " Here a large mound, in every way similar to the Assyrian Tels, shows many traces of an ancient village or town. Most of the remains must be referred to Christian influence."¹ The last remark is true of the buildings which he saw on his visit, but not of those below ground or of the pottery on the surface.

Another village of the territory of Derbe attained some importance. It stood about four miles north from Derbe on the straight road to Iconium ; and the modern name Uteh-Kilisse, " Three Churches," together with the ruins of some large buildings, prove that it possessed considerable importance in the Byzantine time. The place is now an uninhabited mass of ruins, all of a late period, so far as they are visible above ground : one of the buildings was a church. Professor Sterrett, who discovered these remains, appreciates their character rightly (*Wolfe Exped.*, p. 29).²

The description of the roads given above illustrates well the narrative of St. Paul's journeys. On his second journey he came from Syrian Antioch (doubtless through the Cilician Gates) by Laranda to Derbe, next to Lystra, and thence to Iconium, which was about eighteen miles north-north-east of Lystra and a little way off the " Imperial Road " to Pisidian Antioch. But, on the first journey, he fled from Pisidian Antioch along the " Imperial Road." According

¹ *Wolfe Exped.*, p. 29.

² He also was, I think, the first traveller that observed the ruins of Gudelisin.

to the legend of Paul and Thekla (as interpreted in the *Church in the Roman Empire*), when he reached the point where a branch road diverged to Iconium, a few miles distant, he found Onesiphorus waiting for him. Onesiphorus, who had been warned in a dream of his coming, recognized him from the description given of his personal appearance, and invited him to his own house, which was next door to that of Thekla's parents. From Iconium, Paul fled naturally first to Lystra and thence to the more distant Derbe.

Little is said about Derbe in the Book of Acts, and little is recorded of it in any other ancient documents. It was a rather rude Lycaonian town, where education had not made much progress, and therefore it was not fitted to produce much impression on the history of the Church or of Asia Minor. Its inscriptions are late in date, and show little trace of contact with the Roman world. It had a certain factitious importance about the time of St. Paul as being the frontier city on a Roman "Imperial Road," and therefore a station for customs and frontier dues.¹ Stephanus gathered this fact from some lost authority, who described the city as it was between 41 and 74. Owing to this temporary importance it was honoured with the Imperial title, Claudio-Derbe; but it struck no coins until a much later period. It was a city of the Province Galatia till about A.D. 130-135, when it was incorporated in the new triple Province of the "Three Eparchiæ": Cilicia, Isauria, and Lycaonia. An inscription of the third century at Losta was dedicated to the Emperor Gordian by the three Provinces or Eparchiæ.² During this period Iconium and

¹ *λιμὴν* was the name for such a station, whether it was a coast-town and harbour, or an inland city like Derbe. Stephanus Byz. is the only authority who has recorded this fact.

² Sterrett, *loc. cit.*, p. 23, where the author has not observed that *Provinciæ* is a plural, and that the names of two of the Eparchiæ are lost at the end of the inscription. He mentions that the letters are faint.

Lystra continued to form part of the Province Galatia. About A.D. 295 the "Three Eparchies" were divided. Part of Lycaonia, including Derbe, was now assigned to Isauria, another part of Lycaonia (including Iconium) to a new Province, Pisidia; while the rest of Lycaonia continued attached to the Province Galatia. From an authority of the fourth century Stephanus gathered his description of Derbe as "a fortress of Isauria." Finally, about 372, Lycaonia was made a Province by itself, and Derbe was included in it.

One more point requires notice before we part from Derbe. The possibility that the city might have been situated on one of the hills on the southern edge of the plain was alluded to above. We inquired carefully into this, and learned that on one hill only are there any ruins. The second hill west of Hadji-Baba has a huge lump of rock protruding conspicuously out of one side of its summit. This was described to us as covered with walls and houses, built of small stones, with no marble and no inscriptions. The description did not suggest any hope that the Roman Derbe could have been situated there, but rather that a Byzantine fortress had been built on this lofty point during the troubled times of the Arab raids. In order to leave no doubt, however, we ascended the hill. The Kalé, as it is called, is about 1,200 feet above the plain. The ruins cover an oval space of about 150 to 200 yards long by 80 to 100 broad. The walls are not Byzantine work. They are built of small stones, splintered off the native rock, entirely uncut and undressed. The stones are of two sizes. The larger stones were used to form the outer and inner faces of the wall, and rarely, if ever, measure more than a foot in any direction. The smaller stones were mere scraps, piled loosely in to fill up the space between the faces. Not a trace of mortar or any other binding material could be seen

in the walls, except that two cisterns for holding rain-water were faced inside with some hard kind of cement. The small size and wretched character of the fortress and the tiny huts of stone inside it were enough to show that this was not Derbe. But the work is early, not late. The impression of date, suggested by the walls, was confirmed by examination of the numerous fragments of pottery scattered over the surface of the ground. Many of these are evidently pre-Hellenic, belonging to a class which is found widely over ancient sites in Asia Minor, ornamented with alternate zones of darker and lighter hue, yellowish or brownish in tint, analogous to some classes of early Grecian pottery which are roughly and not quite accurately described as Mycenæan.

One might well imagine that this fortress had been the first stronghold of "the robber Antipater," as Strabo expressively calls him in his brief, incisive way, before he succeeded in making himself master of Derbe, about 60 B.C. But it is likely to be of an even early period in origin, and may have seen the city of Derbe grow and decay again.

In conclusion, it seems right to add that the merit and thoroughness of Professor Sterrett's exploration stand out all the more markedly, when one remembers that two skilful and highly trained French scholars travelled through the same country about the same time, and placed Lystra at Losta. They argued partly from the name and partly from a short inscription in the village which mentions "Titus and Gaius, brothers, men of Lystra," as the architects of a building. Titus and his brother, however, must have carried their activity and skill from their native Lystra to Possala. Yet the wrong identification might have been accepted on this very specious and tempting argument, had not Sterrett found conclusive proof of the true position of Lystra.

W. M. RAMSAY.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

THE *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1906, pp. 1-38) opens with a long, timely article, which has since been reprinted in the shape of a monograph, upon the relations between modern exegesis and the exposition of the New Testament. In the course of the argument, the author, Professor von Dobschütz, discusses the basal principles of that exegesis and its alleged incompatibility with the edifying use of the New Testament writings in the Christian church. The fundamental principles are held to be: (a) that the New Testament writings are to be treated like any other pieces of ancient literature. This at once destroys the old Hermeneutic, and implies that the distinction of canonical and uncanonical does not exist for the student. The gain of this has been the enrichment of exegesis by spoils won from contemporary Jewish and Greek literature. (b) Exegesis depends on accurate textual and grammatical criticism, and account must be taken of style and literary form, in order to estimate the significance of a word or phrase. (c) Exegesis deals with the meaning of the author, not with what subsequent ages have read into his words; and not only with the psychological problem of the author's meaning, but with the sense attached to his statement by his readers. One instance of the latter is to be found in the synoptic use of *ἐξουσία*, which is employed in Matthew vii. 27-29 to denote the Divine authority and consciousness of power evinced by Jesus in His preaching. A Gentile reader, accustomed to *ἐξουσία* in the magical sense of power over evil spirits (cf. Reitzenstein's *Poimandres*, pp. 48 f.), would attach this further meaning to the term, and apparently, Luke himself (iv. 36) has thus widened the original scope of the expression.¹

¹ With this explanation, Dr. E. A. Abbott's similar paragraph in his
VOL. I.

Modern exegesis, further, is characterized by three notes : (i.) It claims to be a historical discipline, a claim unheard of till the eighteenth century, when the science began to rebel against being the slave of dogma or homiletic. Hence the vogue of the newer *religionsgeschichtliche* school, which brings out the difference between the modern and the ancient conceptions of the world as a factor in the interpretation of the early Christian literature. "If the eighteenth century discovered the human personality of the Biblical writers, we moderns are confronted with the new and almost painful discovery that they were persons belonging to the ancient world, separated from us by thousands of years (for their view of the world was much older than themselves)." Such conceptions, therefore, as those of angels, demons and the like, are not to be ignored or rationalized in the Gospels and epistles. They are frankly to be estimated as an element in the environment and mental heritage of the early Christians.

In the second place (ii.), modern exegesis is realistic, its effort being directed towards the attainment of concrete and definite ideas in regard to any term or phrase—such as, for example, *in the name* or *in Christ*. In eschatology, particularly, there is a recoil, in the interests of historical exegesis, from the spiritualizing methods of Origen and all his followers, and the same revision of method applies to the newer investigations into the early Christian conception of the Spirit.

Thirdly (iii.), modern exegesis practises the method of

Johannine Grammar (§§ 1572 f.) ought to be compared. He points out, however, that, while Matthew only refers to the authority of doctrine in this connexion, he proceeds, in viii. 9, to suggest that diseases also were under the authority exercised by Christ over the minds and souls of men. "The mischief that might arise from regarding the 'authority' of Christ as a magical power of casting out evil spirits . . . is seen in" Acts viii. 9, where the correlative power of the Holy Spirit is in view.

isolation. "As a philologist declares that, while the legends of the founding of Rome are to be given up as unhistorical, in their entirety, details must be retained as genuine, so is it" with the primitive Christian literature, where special sources are isolated and discussed, apart from the context in which they are found; and not merely different sources in one book, but, as in the case of Pentecost, different conceptions must be taken apart, different phases of reflection, different cycles or strata of tradition.

One result of all this exegetical activity is to stamp, as irrelevant to our day, much of what has hitherto been regarded as Biblical and authoritative, and this raises an undoubtedly serious problem for the preacher who has to use a Bible exposed to such methods of interpretation. But certain considerations have to be borne in mind, which render the chasm between exegesis and exposition less formidable than at first appears. In the first instance, the very emphasis upon exegesis as a historical discipline does not mean that the primitive conception is necessarily to be exalted above the modern. The aim of historical exegesis is not to stop short at a discovery of what is foreign to us in the primitive world of faith, but to expose what was new to those early Christians. Paul's world of angels and demons is unknown to us. We do not breathe that mental air. But, in a passage like Romans viii. 38 f., the supreme element is not the allusions to aërial and angelic powers; it is surely the consciousness that Christ's authority transcends all in heaven and earth, that the Divine love rises higher than all obstacles, and so forth (cf. von Dobschütz's own *Probleme*, pp. 99 f.). And the same criterion applies to the realistic note in modern exegesis. The terms *πλάτος*, *μῆκος*, *ὑψος*, *βάθος*, etc. (cf. Eph. iii. 18) may reflect certain earlier and astral conceptions of Egyptian magic, as Reitzenstein has striven to show (*Poimandres*, p. 25, note 1);

yet their usage and content in the New Testament are not adequately explained by any such discovery of their earlier collocation, or of their philological derivation. Ample illustrations may be gathered, from the Greek mysteries and elsewhere, of the widespread use of language about being *buried with* and *rising with* a god (cf. e.g. Dieterich's *Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 157 f., 169). But such analogies and parallels are far from sounding the depths of passages like Romans vi. and Colossians ii. 11 f. All over, the function of exegesis is to determine what was new and creative in the writer's mind, and, in the case of Paul, his own personality and what he owed to Jesus, go far behind all his debts to rabbinical or Hellenistic Judaism.

This differentiation of theology and personal religion forms one avenue to a proper use of modern exegesis. While the horizon of the soul remains the same, with "its three poles of *God, myself, the world*, the formulas expressing the soul's outlook change with the changing eras. The early Christian writers are valuable to us as religious personalities, whose difference of clothing is, after all, a secondary matter. Exegesis, if sound, unbars the innermost personality of the writer through his words, and if it discharges this part aright, it brings home to the modern reader, behind and below all contemporary differences and details, the permanent and vital heart, which is greater than all the particular modes of its expression.

Such, then, is the function of historical exegesis: to protest against the careless fusion of the old and the modern; to trace development not only from the Old Testament to the New, but within the latter, and thereby to reach the living core and vital force of every writer and agent in the creative era of early Christianity. Exegesis thus ministers, if properly treated, to the best methods of exposition. It produces a sense of reality. It excludes the use of texts

as mere mottoes, and it enriches the resources of the preacher by unlocking the wealth of contemporary religious life which flowed around the early Christians. But this practice of exegesis demands, in dealing with early Christianity as with any other topic, more than philosophical accuracy, literary sensitiveness, and æsthetic feeling. Sympathy and community of spirit are essential to the understanding of these New Testament writings. "Be he ancient or modern, the pious person understands the pious person," and he alone. "Faith still works wonders. It converts the hard stones of the materials gathered by the science of religious history into bread which will satisfy the souls that are hungering for life."

Another article, bearing generally on the interpretation of the Gospels, is Herr Otto Frommel's study in the *Deutsche Revue* for March (pp. 344-358), on the poetry of the Gospel, which consists of some pages from a forthcoming volume on the poetical form of the sayings of Jesus. He discusses and illustrates the ordinary parallelisms and strophic phenomena pretty much as Professor Briggs did, some years ago, in the *Expository Times*. He draws attention to the incisive, plastic, and concrete character of Christ's teaching, as a supreme condition of its popularity, and at this point attaches himself cordially to H. Weinel's views in *die Bildersprache Jesu in ihrer Bedeutung für die Erforschung seines inneren Lebens* (1900). It is incredible, he thinks, that the synoptic tradition can be correct in attributing to Jesus the motives of Mark iv. 11 = Matthew xiii. 10-15, inasmuch, as elsewhere, the object of His parabolic teaching was not to confuse or puzzle, but to instruct. "Allegory," he also asserts, surely with some rashness, "teaches nothing; whereas the parable aims at proving something." As to the parable of the unjust steward, Frommel insists on a recogni-

tion of the humour in it. "The moral conduct of the steward was not in the mind of Jesus, who could not, of course, have approved of it. But he did not need to be eternally moralizing; and consequently he could tell this story, and even the not less humorous one of the widow and the judge." "Yet," for all His artistic sense, "Jesus was not in the first instance a poet. To none less than to Him would the term *l'art pour l'art* apply. His parables will only reveal their depths to him who can pierce through the shimmering mist of their poetry into the divinely filled soul from which they sprang."

In the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1906 pp. 18-60), Herr J. Häcker presents an exegetical study of the virgin-birth within the New Testament literature. In Paul he finds such a conception not merely unexpressed, but inherently unlikely. The Johannine and other Christologies ignore it, and consequently the stress of the discussion falls on the synoptic narratives, i.e. on Matthew i. and Luke i. 5-ii. 52. Matthew i. 16 originally ran, according to Häcker, Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν (ἐκ Μαρίας) τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν. The four textual variants are all editorial attempts to amend this, in order to bring the genealogy into line with the contents of i.-ii. In the Lucan genealogy, similarly, the words ὡς ἐνομιζέτο (iii. 33) are an insertion, in order to adapt the genealogy of Jesus, as David's son, to the preceding narrative. Even then, Häcker deletes i. 34-37 as an interpolation, thus extending the interpolation not only from the limits suggested by Kattenbusch and Weinel (*since I knew not a man*, i. 27), but beyond even those of Hillmann, Harnack, Usener, Zimmermann, Schmiedel, Conybeare, and others, who delete i. 34-35 as an intrusion upon the text. Carrying out this argument, which regards the original story of Luke as narrating the

birth of Jesus in ordinary fashion, Häcker reads *γυναικί* in ii. 5.

A simultaneous statement, on the conservative side, is ably put by Mr. J. G. Machen in *The Princeton Theological Review* (1906, pp. 37-81, the second article of the series), who examines and rejects all attempts to prove that the references to the virgin-birth are interpolated. His conclusion is (p. 80): "Lobstein is correct in supposing that there might well have been a natural impulse in the early Church to invest Jesus' birth with the miraculous. But neither he nor any one else has shown how that impulse could have manifested itself in just the particular form in which it is now crystallized, unless in dependence upon fact. If Jesus was really divine, then we can say that probably there was something miraculous about His birth. Starting from that position, the most probable conclusion is that the canonical infancy narratives correctly inform us as to what that 'something' was. For otherwise it is hard to see how they could have been evolved."

Further evidence of the interest excited in this question at present throughout the United States is afforded by Dr. R. J. Cooke's article on "Did Paul know of the Virgin Birth?" in the *Methodist Review* (1906, pp. 248-261), and by a symposium in the *American Journal of Theology* (Jan. 1906, pp. 1-30) upon "The Supernatural Birth of Jesus: can it be established historically? Is it essential to Christianity?" Dr. Cooke finds strong presumptive evidence that the Apostle did know of the virgin-birth, which must have been to him a presupposition of Christ's sinlessness. Besides, Luke, his friend and companion, evidently was familiar with it. In the symposium, Professor Warfield argues similarly that the supernatural work of redemption

requires a supernatural birth of the Saviour, and that the latter is bound up with Christ's capacity and character as the redeemer of men. Dr. A. C. Zenos, of Chicago, and Dr. Rush Rhees, of Rochester, handle the subject more cautiously and historically; the former regards the virgin-birth as incapable, on the one hand, of demonstration, yet not susceptible of disproof; while the latter, starting from the fact that the tradition of the virgin-birth exercised no essential influence over apostolic Christianity, concludes that it cannot be regarded as essential to the highest Christology of the Church. Professor Bacon, in a brief and thorough examination of the historical evidence, goes even further. His verdict on the birth narratives is unfavourable to their early origin and credibility, Matthew's in particular being described as "highly legendary." The source of the tradition he regards, not as pagan, but as Jewish, due largely to the Pauline idea of the spiritual birth of believers, who are the collective Christ. "Logically, the idea of the virgin-birth would seem to be a hybrid, if not a monstrosity. Historically, it reflects the spirit of the post-apostolic age." This point of view approximates to that of A. Neuman in his recent volume on the Life of Jesus (*Jesus, wer er geschichtlich war*, 1904), and a similar critical attitude towards the birth narratives is assumed by Dr. Furrer in *das Leben Jesu Christi* (1905) and Professor Nathaniel Schmidt in his volume on *The Prophet of Nazareth* (1905, pp. 248 f.), the latter adopting the Sinaitic Syriac reading in Matthew i. 16 (*Joseph begat Jesus*), and following Hillmann's deletion of Luke i. 34-35 (with the *ὡς ἐνομιζετο* of iii. 23) as a later interpolation.

JAMES MOFFATT.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, M.A., D.D. ¹	
Notes from the Lecture Room of Epictetus	132
Most Rev. William Alexander, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of Armagh.	
Turning the Hearts of the Children to their Fathers	78
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Life of Christ according to St. Mark	346
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
The Son of Man as the Light of the World	115
Right Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.	
"The Just Shall Live by Faith"	178
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
The Archangel Michael in the Light of Criticism	289
Rev. H. W. Clark, M.A.	
Paul's Doctrine of the Transformation of Experience	171
Stanley A. Cook, M.A.	
Old Testament Notes	92, 286, 477
The Criticism of the Old Testament	524
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Evolution and Christian Theology	6
The Editor.	
Twenty-one Years of the "Expositor"	1
Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
Studies in the "Inner Life" of Jesus:	
The Perfection of Character	304
The Consciousness of the Son	496
Rev. G. Harford, M.A.	
The Higher Criticism as it Affects Faith and Spiritual Life	246

	PAGE
J. H. A. Hart, M.A.	
The Scribes of the Nazarenes	193
Rev. Canon Edward Lee Hicks, M.A.	
The Communistic Experiment of Acts ii and iv.	21
Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A.	
The Amorite Calendar	337
Rev. J. H. Jowett, M.A.	
The Faithlessness of the Average Man	85
Rev. Professor Kirsopp Lake, M.A.	
Galatians ii 3-5	236
Rev. C. Lattey, S.J.	
The Structure of the Fourth Gospel	424
Rev. David M. McIntyre.	
The Prayer of Perfection.	161
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil.	
The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl	404
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A.	
Dr. Emil Reich on the Failure of the Higher Criticism	51
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Notes on Recent New Testament Study	183, 470, 561
A Daughter of Jacob	226
Rev. W. J. Moulton, M.A.	
The New Covenant in Jeremiah	370
Rev. Professor Eberhard Nestle, D.D.	
"From the Tree"	383
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
The Christian Inscriptions of Lycaonia	32, 144
Tarsus	258, 353, 453
Derbe	544
Rev. Theodore H. Robinson, B.D.	
The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon	481
Rev. Professor Sanday, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Spiritual Meaning of the Life of Christ	385

INDEX OF TEXTS

571

Rev. Professor G. A. Smith, D.D., LL.D.	PAGE
Jeremiah's Jerusalem	61, 97
The Desolate City	320
The Ideal City and the Real	435
The Second Temple, from Zechariah to Ezra	510
Rev. W. L. Walker, M.A.	
The Cross in Relation to Sin: Can a Moral Theory Leave this Out	209
Rev. Prebendary B. Whitefoord, M.A., D.D.	
"The Church in the House"	278

INDEX OF TEXTS

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. i.-xi.	530	Isa. i. 13	512	Jon. ii. 6	286
iii. 22	301	viii. 5-8	478	Hab. ii. 4	178
vi. 2, 4	502	ix. 6	258	Zech. i.-viii.	480
ix. 9-17	372	xi. 1-9	379	Mal. i. 10	513
x. 2	459	xl.-lv.	438	ii. 10-16	519
4	368	xl. 1, 2	441	iv. 6	78
7	541	xlii. 1-4	497	Mat. i. 16	568
xi. 7	301	lx. 6	512	iii. 11	424
xvii. 7	372	lxiii. 9	300	15	497
xxi. 22	480	lxxv. 10	518	vi. 28-30	197
Exod. xiv. 13	382	lxxvi. 24	110	vii. 6	184
xxiii. 21	300	Jer. ii. 8	379	27-29	561
xxvi. 36	512	iv. 14	66	viii. 32	306
Deut. iv. 13	375	vi. 1-8	66	ix. 27	496
xxix. 1	374	16	197	x. 32, 33	311
xxxiii. 10	512	vii. 1-15	68	35	187
1 Sam. ii. 12	379	4	102	xi. 19	499
v. 9	382	22, 23	374	xvi. 16, 17	118
1 Kings vi. 36	514	32	114	18, 19	471
viii. 2	131	x. 9	368	xvii. 24	30
2 Kings xv. 35	103	xxiii. 13-15	73	xxiii. 34	203
xxiii. 10	113	xxvi. 1	68	xxiv. 30	85
xxiv. 6	74	xxvii.	76	xxv. 18	85
15, 16	321	xxx. 31	376	xxvi. 6-13	200
xxv. 9	323	31-34	370	xxviii. 19	187
2 Chron. xxi. 16	541	40	111	Mark i. 1	424
xxiv. 19	205	xxxiv. 8	98	ii. 10	309
xxx. 15	287	xxxv. 4	103	iii. 22	201
xxxvi. 15	206	xxxvi. 20	105	33-35	306
Ezra iv. 4, 5	448	xxxvii. 1-10	99	vi. 8	23
vi. 3	511	xl. 13	442	x. 38	191
Job xxxiii. 23	289	lii. 28-30	322	47	496
Ps. viii. 4	501	Lam. ii.	327	xi. 15	70
4-6	120	iv. 22	437	xiii. 32	505
lxxxii. 6	502	Ezek. xvi. 18	512	xiv. 1, 2	348
cxxxii. 3	105	xxiii. 25	447	3-9	200, 349
cxxxvii.	438	xxvii. 12	368	14-16	351
cxl. 11	109	Dan. viii. 16	295	Luke i. 17	78

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Luko i. 77 . . .	498	John xv. 3 . . .	558	1 Cor. xv. 14-17 . . .	311
ii. 49 . . .	503	xix. 37 . . .	428	28 . . .	509
iv. 21 . . .	497	xx. 17 . . .	22	47 . . .	399
36 . . .	561	xxi. 11 . . .	192	2 Cor. xi. 13 . . .	487
xi. 49 . . .	203	Acts i. 6-8 . . .	120	Gal. ii. 3-5 . . .	236, 494
xii. 23 . . .	119	ii. 44 . . .	24	ii. 11 . . .	473
xiv. 1 . . .	201	iv. 32 . . .	25	iii. 11 . . .	178
xvi. 15 . . .	314	v. 4 . . .	26	28 . . .	280
xix. 10 . . .	499	x. 37 . . .	424	Eph. iii. 18 . . .	563
xxiv. 47 . . .	187	xii. 15 . . .	187	Phil. ii. 4 . . .	39
John i. 9 . . .	122	xv. 23 . . .	183	9, 11 . . .	509
11 . . .	207	xvi. 6 . . .	473	Col. i. 24 . . .	279
26 . . .	425	Rom. i. 1 . . .	200	ii. 8 . . .	292
iii. 5 . . .	558	7 . . .	281	11 . . .	564
iv. 1 . . .	187	14 . . .	364	iv. 15 . . .	283
v. 22 . . .	311	17 . . .	178	1 Thess. ii. 16. . . .	39
vii. 14-16 . . .	208	viii. 38 . . .	563	2 Tim. ii. 15 . . .	39
49 . . .	201	xi. 5, 11 . . .	207	Heb. ii. 11 . . .	312
viii. 46 . . .	306	xvi. 2, 5 . . .	282	x. 38 . . .	178
ix. 35 . . .	121	1 Cor. iv. 17 . . .	280	1 Pet. iii. 1 . . .	80
xi. 3 . . .	426	ix. 1 . . .	203	Rev. i. 18 . . .	471
xi. 27 . . .	497	xi. 19 . . .	280	xxii. 8 . . .	292
xii. 2-8 . . .	200	xii. 28 . . .	204		
20-36 . . .	115	xv. 14 . . .	196		

